Vol. XXXII. OCTOBER, 1955. No. 4

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance,* 15/-.

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Military Camp, Waiouru, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tas.
Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn — Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.
Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. J. O'Connor, Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Dubbo, N.S.W.
Diocese of Bunbury—V. Rev. C. Cunningham, Dardanup, W.A.
Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.
Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Cathedral, Geraldton, W.A.
Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Sandgate, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.
Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Adm., Wangaratta, V.
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.
Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—Rt. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Albury, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes — Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.
Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The

Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 283
Motu Proprio on foundation of special primary work for religious vocations—Statutes of above Work—Queries on the interpretation of decree about the simplification of the rubrics—Condemnation of certain books and newspapers.

CONTRITION AND ABSOLUTION,
Rev. Augustine Regan, C.SS.R. 288

ARCHDEACON JOHN McENCROE (1795-1868), VIII,
Rev. Roger Wynne 308

THE THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF LAW,
Rev. Patrick M. Farrell, O.P., S.T.D. 319

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, Rev. Clement Tierney, D.D. .. 326
The Queenship of Mary.

MORAL THEOLOGY .. Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 332
Confessor's advice and the use of the Safe Period—Absolution from Censure.

CANON LAW .. Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, P.C., D.C.L. 341
Marriage case concerning the canonical form of marriage.

LITURGY .. .. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 349
Baptismal Font in hospital oratory—More about the simplified Rubrics —Building a Church.

HOMILETICS .. .. .. Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 358
On Mount Olivet—The Pater.

NOTES 363
Solitary sins (Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D.).

BOOK REVIEWS 371
The Sacrifice of the Mystical Body (Masure); The Irish Exiles in Australia (Kiernan); Matt Talbot and his times (Purcell); The Theology of the Spiritual Life (Guibert); Church Building and Furnishing (O'Connell) [p. 353]; The Problem of Onanism (Gagern) [p. 364]; What is Chastity (Boylan) [p. 368]; The Formative Years (Leary) [p. 370].

SHORT NOTICES 307, 318, 325, 331, 370

GENERAL INDEX FOR VOLUME XXXII 375

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Octobris, 1955.

Official Documents

MOTU PROPRIO

Responding to Our supreme paternal solicitude, the Sacred Congregation of Religious has announced its intention to found a special primary Work for religious vocations. Its object shall be to further religious vocations in every possible way, and especially by establishing similar Works in many parts of the world. Thus there will be a common effort to stimulate the good will of all concerned towards fostering, protecting and helping vocations to the States of Christian perfection. Means will be employed to spread right ideas about the dignity and utility of the states of perfection. Likewise, the faithful of all parts of the world will be encouraged to unite their prayers and works of piety for the same intention. This Work We wish to see established as a Papal Work, directed by the said Sacred Congregation, and We hereby, with the fullness of Apostolic power and by Our own proper motion, decree its institution, adding the faculty of aggregating Works and persons to itself, when that is required, and extending all indulgences granted or to be granted and, similarly, other spiritual favours to all who are enrolled.

This decree is henceforth in force and remains in force, everything to the contrary, even if worthy of special mention, notwithstanding.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, on the 11th day of February, in the year 1955, the 16th of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII, POPE.

* * * *

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RELIGIOUS
PAPAL WORK FOR RELIGOUS VOCATIONS

I

Statutes

1. The Papal Work for keeping and fostering vocations to the States of perfection is a primary Work instituted by our Holy Lord, Pope Pius XII, through the Apostolic Letters *motu proprio,* beginning with the words *Cum supremae,* and given on February 11, 1955.

2. This Papal Work has its centre at the Sacred Congregation of Religious.

3. For the pursuit of its special purpose the Papal Work:

(a) sees, in the first place, to the spread of a genuine conception

of the nature, utility and excellence of the States of perfection, as this is set forth in the more recent papal documents;

(b) promotes works of piety, penance and charity, that God may grant many very good vocations to the States of perfection;

(c) fosters the growth of works already erected in various regions for the promotion of religious vocations, and sees to their erection, where they do not yet exist.

4. To the Papal Work the following bodies may be aggregated:

All Religious Orders and Congregations and similar Societies, secular Institutes, either of men or women, monasteries and religious houses, Councils of Major Superiors (men or women), such as now exist in many countries, also any Works founded in view of cultivating and helping vocations.

The following may be enrolled in the same Papal Work:

Ecclesiastical Colleges, and Catholic Associations, all the faithful of Christ, clerical and lay, who wish to help so great a Work.

5. The Papal Work of Religious Vocations is committed to the patronage of the Holy Family of Nazareth. This Holy Family is a perfect example for all States of perfection, "an example of the sweet and efficacious union of contemplative life with active life." (Apostolic Constitution *Sponsa Christi.*)

Rome, February 11, 1955.

VALERIO Card. VALERI, *Prefect.*
Fr. Arcadius Larraona C.M.F., *Secretary.*

II

Norms for carrying out the Statutes

Government

His Eminence, the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Religious, is President of the Papal Work of Vocations: the Secretary of the same Sacred Congregation is Vice-president.

The Papal Work takes nothing away from the autonomy and lawful liberty of special Works which have their own laws and ordinances.

Enrolment

Petition for aggregation or enrolment on behalf of ecclesiastical colleges and of other institutions or catholic associations—likewise, on behalf of other special Works for religious vocations, should come from the Directors of such bodies.

When aggregation or enrolment takes place, the Papal Work gives a diploma to Societies, and to persons a special certificate.

All who are enrolled shall contribute a small annual sum.

Pious Exercises

The following exercises are greatly recommended, in view of obtaining good vocations from God, together with the necessary helps for the happy realisation of those vocations.

1. Abstinence and fast on the vigils of the Assumption of the B.V.M. and of the Nativity of Our Lord Jesus Christ, undertaken for the special intention of the Work of religious vocations;

2. Prayers offered unintermittently by the States of perfection themselves in turn;

3. Celebration of *a day of religious vocations,* with the pious exercise approved through the Decree of the S.C. of Rites and enriched with special indulgences by the Sacred Penitentiary.

4. Celebration of *a day of offering,* in which the sick shall offer their pains and afflictions, together with the Precious Blood, for religious vocations.

Activity of the Papal Work

It will be the task of the Papal Work:

1. To provide for the printing and publication of writings calculated to promote greater knowledge and esteem of the dignity and utility of religious vocation;

2. To remind priests of the importance of using every opportunity to treat this subject (e.g. Lenten sermons, retreats, novenas, catechetic instructions for adults, etc.);

3. To exhort the faithful to study the documents of the Holy See, the works of the Fathers, and the writings of pious authors who have dealt with the States of evangelical perfection and the religious life;

4. To foster in boys and girls and in young people of both sexes, especially those under the care of Religious, an esteem of religious life, and to develop in them an intimate desire of Christian perfection;

5. To call congresses for the discussion of this subject, or at least to secure that in congresses, not expressly convened for this, there be some attention given to religious vocations;

6. To maintain relations with Orders, Congregations, Societies and Institutes aggregated; to promote special works and existing enterprises that are useful, securing for them opportunity for communication and the most helpful means.

Feasts

The chief feasts of the Papal Work shall be:

1. the feast of the Holy Family (Sunday within Octave of the Epiphany);

2. the feast of all Holy Founders;

3. the feast of SS. Peter and Paul, June 29;

4. the onomastic day of the Sovereign Pontiff, who is the supreme Director of the States of perfection.

Rome, February 11, 1955.

VALERIO Card. VALERI, *Prefect.*
Fr. Arcadius Larraona, *Secretary.*

* * * *

QUERIES

on the interpretation of the Decree of the S.C.R. (March 23, 1955) regarding the simplification of the rubrics

1. Whether on days from January 2-5 and from 7-12 Mass of the Dead may be celebrated in choir?

Answer: *No.*

2. Whether on the days of the suppressed octave of the Epiphany, in the ferial office, the Antiphons to the *Benedictus* and *Magnificat* are to be said as noted for each day within the octave?

Answer: *Yes.*

3. Since on Sundays that were formerly within the octaves of the Ascension and Corpus Christi and the Sacred Heart of Jesus the office (according to title I, 19) is to be said "as now", the questions arise: (a) What colour are the vestments? (b) What Preface is to be said?

Answer: On the Sunday within the suppressed octave of the Ascension, the colour of the vestments is *white,* and the Preface is of *the Ascension*; on the Sundays within the suppressed octaves of Corpus Christi and the Sacred Heart the colour of the vestments is *green* and the Preface of *the Trinity.*

4. Whether the number of commemorations (cfr. tit. II, 4, a, 6, c) is to be understood as meaning that the commemorations admitted are "besides and after" commemorations never to be omitted?

Answer: *No* (according to n. 3. tit. II on not exceeding Ternary number).

5. Whether commemorated feasts according to title II, 5 still enjoy in the office a ninth lesson, historical or evangelical?

Answer: *No.*

6. Whether a feast of any title or mystery of the Lord occurring on a Sunday acquires first Vespers.

Answer: *Yes,* because it holds the place of the Sunday.

7. Regarding the office of the B.V.M. on Saturday: Is it reduced to a commemoration?

Answer: *No.*

8. What Antiphon is to be said at a feast which has no first Vespers?

Answer: The Antiphon of 2nd Vespers of the preceding Sunday.

9. Regarding solemn votive Masses it is asked: Whether the rubrics stand which prescribe their commemoration under one conclusion with the Oratio of the day, when their celebration is impeded?

Answer: *Yes,* if the oratio is prescribed under precept; *No,* if it is only permitted *ad libitum.* At Forty Hours, however, and on occasions of Exposition during the year, the Oratio of the B. Sacrament is always to be said at all Masses which are celebrated at the altar of exposition only.

10. Whether, according to title V, 4, collects ordered *simpliciter* by the Ordinary are omitted when the *orationes,* together with collects, have reached the ternary number.

Answer: Collects ordered *simpliciter* by the Ordinary are omitted when the *orationes,* together with collects, have reached the ternary number.

June 2, 1955.

Notices

The Holy Office has announced (Apr. 16, 1955) the humble submission of Joseph Thomé to the condemnation of his book: *Der Mündige Christ.* On March 23, the same Holy Office condemned the work of Marcelle de Jouvenel, *Au diapason du ciel;* and, on June 8, prohibited two Polish publications: *Boleslaw piazecki Zagadnienia Istotne* and the Weekly *Dzisi Jutso;* also two Hungarian publications: *A Kerestz* and *Bulletin Catholique Hongrois.*

W. LEONARD.

Contrition and Absolution

Summary:

I. TEACHING OF TRENT.

II. LATER THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSIONS.

1. Justification through perfect contrition.
2. Attrition as a sufficient disposition for absolution.
3. Does sovereign attrition include love of God?
4. Does absolution dispense with need of perfect contrition for justification? Three tendencies amongst theologians.
5. Difference between S. Thomas and many moderns regarding the efficacy of absolution, and notions of attrition and contrition.

III. CONCLUDING PASTORAL OBSERVATIONS.

1. Pulpit instruction on contrition, necessity and fruits of confession.
2. Confessional practice, especially concerning the dispositions of formal recidives and the obligation to avoid occasions of sin.

How many people guilty of mortal sin are actually forgiven before they receive absolution? What should be the relative emphasis in our pastoral instructions and confessional exhortations on the necessity of perfect contrition for every sin, the ease of perfect contrition, the necessity and efficacy of sacramental absolution? The following pages are an attempt to outline and evaluate certain doctrinal positions which, unconsciously or otherwise, are apt to influence the attitude of preachers, confessors, and pastors on the above and similar questions. We shall conclude by proposing what seems safe and reliable norms of pulpit instruction and confessional practice.

TEACHING OF TRENT:

The great Council of Trent has thrown the strong beacon-light of its infallible teaching over the whole area of justification, whether justification itself, or justification through the Sacrament of Penance.[1] What will concern us here can be expressed in the following three points:

(i) No mortal sin committed after Baptism can be forgiven except in relation to the Power of the Keys. One must either receive sacramental absolution, or have a sincere, even if only implicit, desire for it.

(ii) Sometimes contrition, perfected by charity, including as it does a sufficient desire for absolution, remits mortal sin even before absolution is actually received.

(iii) Imperfect contrition or attrition arising from consideration of the ugliness of sin or from the fear of hell and God's

[1]Sess vi: Sess xiv ch.4 (Denziger n. 897-98).

punishments, if it excludes the will to sin and is accompanied by the hope of pardon, is good and useful and an impulse of the Holy Spirit. Though it cannot justify a man outside the Sacrament of Penance, it disposes the sinner to obtain justification in the Sacrament itself.[2]

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSIONS:

The more one considers the above points, translating almost literally the words of the Council, the more will he be struck by the precision with which certain things are put beyond all discussion, while other things are delicately implied and others, again, are left completely undetermined. Thus discussion and controversy, together with certain decisions of the Magisterium, have served to bring out the clear implications of the Council's teaching, and have made clear also the various opinions that can be held by theologians with perfect loyalty to Holy Church. We shall endeavour to outline the main trends of theological thought from Trent to the present time. We shall do so by considering the possible answers to various questions of great practical importance, noting, as occasion demands, their weight and their bearing on the ministry of pulpit or confessional.

1. Does extra-sacramental contrition always justify?

This is a question which modern theologians answer with a categorical and unanimous affirmative, and, in fact, any other answer would seem erroneous in view of the condemnation by Pope St. Pius V of a proposition of Baius, which confined the efficacy of perfect contrition to the case of necessity or martyrdom.[3]

The Jansenists, however, maintained that only intense contrition remitted mortal sin outside the Sacrament, interpreting the words of Trent — "contritionem caritate perfectam" — to mean not only that contrition must be informed or motivated by charity, but that charity must bring it to the fullest perfection or intensity.

St. Alphonsus gives great attention to this opinion in his "Theologia Moralis", devoting more than seven columns in the edition of Gaudé to its refutation.[4] He says that the essential perfection of contrition or charity has nothing to do with its intenseness or remissness, but arises from the fact that the will clings to God because of His Goodness. Hence to say that remiss charity, meaning by that, charity that adheres to the Sovereign Good even though with no great intensity, does not

---

[2]Denz. 898, cfr. can. 5 on attrition (Denz. 915).
[3]Denz. n. 1071.
[4]lib. vi n. 441-442 (Gaudé vol. 111, p. 442-446).

forgive mortal sin is clearly to contradict Trent. In view of this and other arguments from the Magisterium, from the Scriptures, from the very nature of charity and perfect contrition, the Holy Doctor concludes: "ex his omnibus . . . patet . . . sententiam, quae dicit contritionem cum caritate remissa non iustificare extra sacramentum, esse omnino improbabilem et falsam".[5]

It is not hard to understand why St. Alphonsus so resolutely opposed this piece of rigorism, involving as it does such disastrous consequences for souls. If a person in mortal sin cannot recover the grace of God outside confession without an act of contrition so intense that only a perfect person can make it, then how many are going to try to shake off their miserable state? Most, without doubt, will remain without any inclination to excite themselves to sorrow. What is worse, they will be only too likely to fall into fresh sins and when the opportunity of confession presents itself will be so oppressed by the weight of their sins as to be little inclined to go. In any case, if a man thinks it is useless trying to arouse himself to the intense degree of sorrow he imagines necessary to recover the grace of God without absolution, he will be less and less disposed to make the effort necessary to arouse himself to any kind of sorrow, even the attrition necessary for fruitful absolution. Add to this the despair apt to be engendered by this view in a man who finds himself in danger of death with no priest available, and we have a picture of its practical pastoral consequences that is gloomy indeed.

Jansenism is now completely dead as a doctrine, but one of its consequences can be seen in the dwindling, but not yet completely unknown, assumption amongst members of the faithful, that it is rare, indeed, to obtain forgiveness of sins outside the sacrament of Penance —only saints can love God enough to have perfect contrition. It is taken for granted that only very intense sorrow can justify extra-sacramentally, and since such extra-sacramental justification is the effect of perfect contrition it is concluded that perfect contrition cannot be had without intense love of God and so for the ordinary person is almost impossible.[6]

---

[5]p. 446 cl. 1. The Holy Doctor here refers to another condemned proposition of Baius acc. to which "homo existens in peccato mortali . . . potest habere veram caritatem" cfr. Denz. n. 1070.

[6]cfr. articles of Fr. A. Brennan, C.SS.R., in A. C. Rec. Oct. 1947, April 1948, especially p. 277-280 of the Oct. article, where authorities are quoted on the relative ease of the act of contrition. For St. Alphonsus and the Jansenists cfr Cacciatore, C.SS.R. — S. Alphonso De' Liguori e Il Giansenismo — especially p. 466-70.

2. Is attrition sufficient disposition for absolution?

Consistently enough the theologians who considered only intense contrition could justify extra-sacramentally were among those who denied the sufficiency of attrition in the sacrament. Even sacramental absolution, they said, requires contrition for its fruitfulness, though it need not be intense.

Principally round this point of the sufficiency of attrition for justification centres the famous attritionist-contritionist controversy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, whose bitterness can be gleaned from the Decree of Alexander VII forbidding the disputants to attach theological censures to their opponents.[7] The name of St. Alphonsus comes into the history of the controversy and, as one would expect, he is a stalwart champion of the attritionist position.[8] He argues carefully and lengthily from the teaching of Trent as well as from the very nature of Penance as a sacrament of the dead. He concludes that the attritionist position is morally certain and that, after Trent, contritionism has no intrinsic probability.[9]

The Saint's arguments can be found in any manual of Dogmatic or Moral Theology and need not be repeated here except in a most summary way. His points are: first, if attrition does not suffice as a sufficient preparation for fruithful absolution, then the distinction of Trent between its inefficacy outside the sacrament and its disposing power within it becomes pointless, because, of its nature, it always disposes to justification remotely:—and second, if contrition *must* precede absolution, then the latter would never effect what it signifies, that is the remission of sins, seeing that contrition and mortal sin are incompatible.[10]

---

[7]May 1667 cfr. Denz. 1146.

[8]ibid n. 440.

[9]"non immerito . . . eam vocant moraliter certam; et oppositam, post concilium dicunt omnem probabilitatem amisisse" ibid. Gaudé p. 441. The controversy is now, in its historical form, a dead issue, some modern theologians even defending attritionism as theologically certain and condemning contritionism as erroneous (vg. Hervé, Pesch, Doronzo). Others simply defend the former as morally certain (vg. Merkelbach). D'Alès, while agreeing with this, allows that either view be taught (De Penitentia p. 77).

Dr. B. Poshmann, the distinguished historian of the Dogma of Penance, has elaborated his own theory based on his interpretation of the Fathers, favouring within its framework a mild form of contritionism ("Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte: Busse and Letzte ölung, p. 111). As we shall see later, St. Thomas is neither contritionist nor attritionist in the modern sense, and his mild and salutary doctrine has nothing in common, either in its spirit or consequences, with the rigorist form of contritionism so resolutely opposed by St. Alphonsus.

[10]This second argument can, it seems, be slightly recast and even gain in force in view of the milder form of contritionism sponsored by St. Thomas,

The attritionist view, considered in the historical setting of the life and times of St. Alphonsus, certainly favoured the mild and prudent principles he laid down for the imparting of absolution to relapsing sinners. Contrition, as conceived by his opponents, even in the remiss degree they required for absolution, was hardly an easy thing for the weak individual struggling against a habit of sin, for great stress was laid on the need of disinterested love.[11] A confessor looking for perfect contrition in his penitent and having in mind the idea of perfect contrition conceived by the rigorists would hesitate long about absolving the kind of person mentioned above. Should he not first prove the true character of his sorrow by remaining out of sin for some considerable time? Thus the unfortunate victims of rigorism were left to struggle on without the aid of sacramental grace and, as the Most Zealous Doctor testifies from his own personal experience, lapsed into a state of despair, living for many years in complete neglect of the Sacraments.[12]

3. Under what conditions is attrition sufficient?

Naturally we presuppose it must be supernatural and, since it should be discernible to the confessor, externally manifested. Other qualities are summed up in the words of Trent: "si voluntatem peccandi excludit cum spe veniae".[13] Whatever leads a man to attrition, whether fear of Hell or the filthiness of sin supernaturally conceived, it must aim at the destruction of mortal sin as an offence against God's Sovereign Rights and hence as the greatest of all evils. Consequently, the will of one who is truly attrite must be opposed to all serious sin, and resolved to suffer any loss rather than ever sin mortally in the future. All this is summed up, again, in the current teaching that attrition required for fruitful absolution must be sovereign ("attritio appreciative summa"), universal and efficacious.

It must be well noted that the above description of attrition, that of the Council itself, would not hold if there were not already in the will of the sinner some turning to God—otherwise there would not be

---

as we shall later point out. In fact, St. Alphonsus' phrasing of the argument is scarcely incompatible with the view that contrition normally precedes absolution, though not required of absolute necessity (see below).

[11]We shall later give references to show St. Alphonsus by no means shared the view that completely disinterested love is required for perfect charity or contrition in its essential requisites (see below) n. 48).

[12]"Numquid recidivi, cum sine absolutione dimittuntur, gratia sacramentali carentes, omnes validiores fiunt et emendantur? Quot miseros ipse cognovi, qui ob denegatam absolutionem se dejecerunt in desperationem, et per plures annos a sacramentis aversi aberrarunt?" (lib. vi. n. 464. Gaudé, v. 3, p. 477. 1).

[13]Sess. xiv. c. 4. Denz. 898.

the will of not offending Him. Moreover the sinner's will already looks to God for pardon—"cum spe veniae".

Must we say, then, that the attrite sinner already loves God in some incipient way? There is no reference to the need for such love in Sess. XIV cap. 4 of Trent where attrition is explicitly treated. Still an affirmative answer to our question can hardly be doubted,[14] because of what the Council teaches elsewhere and also from the nature of attrition itself.

Treating the problem of justification itself, the Tridentine Fathers make explicit mention of initial love of God as the principle of the detestation of sin and penance that must precede Baptism.[15] What precisely is this initial love? It cannot be true charity, even in a remiss degree, unless we are to retract everything already said against the Contritionists. Must it be explicit or will implicit suffice? Is it the love of simple benevolence, considered by some as distinct from the love of mutual benevolence or charity, or the love of concupiscence?

Without going into a discussion of the above questions, we can state simply that neither the words of Trent nor any cogent theological reason compel us to see in this necessary initial love of God any more than an implicit love of concupiscence,[16] distinct from and preparatory to the love of friendship which will come with sanctifying grace. A man cannot be sorry for his sins as the supreme evil and resolve never to sin again while looking to God to deliver him from the consequences of sin—"cum spe veniae"—without "in actu exercito"— adhering to God as His Sovereign Judge and Benefactor, the Source of his liberation and justification. This adherence is a love of concupiscence, a love of God as good to us and verifies the words of the Council of attrite sinners —"illum (Deum) tanquam omnis iustitiae fontem diligere incipiunt".

One or two practical points for the confessor emerge from the above. One is that once it is clear that a penitent has a soveretign detestation for sin, he is certainly disposed for absolution. The confessor need not look anxiously for any more explicit sign of love. Whatever

---

[14]Some have held a negative opinion, but only verbally, as they exclude only the need for an explicit love.

[15]"illumque (Deum) tanquam omnis iustitiae fontem diligere incipiunt ac *propterea* moventur adversus peccata per odium aliquod et detestationem, hoc est, per eam penitentiam, quam ante baptismum agi oportet (Denz. 798).

[16]cfr. among recent authors Bover, S.J., De Penitentia (1942) p. 329-331, Doronzo, O.M.I., De Penitentia v. 2 (1951) p. 339. A work of Fr. Périnelle, O.P. L'attrition d'après le Concile de Trente et d'après S. Thomas d'Aquin (Bibliotheque Thomiste 1927), maintaining the love of simple benevolence is required for sovereign attrition, occasioned much discussion. This view is rejected by most cfr. Galtier, S.J., De Penitentia, p. 386.

theologians might say about the need of some imperfect love and however they might disagree about its nature, they would all admit it is necessarily present once attrition is a sovereign supernatural sorrow for having offended God. The fundamental dispute is whether the love certainly there is explicit and formal, or merely implicit.

This, however, is not to say the confessor is not to propose motives of divine love as motives of sorrow. No doubt the ordinary hardened sinner turning to God from the fear of Hell will love Him all the more resolutely, because he sees in Him not only His Sovereign Liberator, but also the Ruthless Avenger of unrepented sin. It is the task of the zealous confessor to inject into the sorrow of his penitent as much explicit love of God as possible—love which will not dispel his fear, but will rather transform it into one that is more salutary because it is more filial.[17]

The fact is—and theologians are coming to recognise it more and more—that sovereign attrition involving the necessary implicit love of God is scarcely ever recognisable without its being more likely than not on the very verge of true or perfect contrition. Nobody can tell the exact moment when the less perfect sorrow gives way to the more perfect. Moreover, one can hardly be conscious of a love of God that gives rise to a sovereign detestation of sin without loving Him with the love of true friendship or charity, as we shall afterwards try to make clear.

A clear realisation of the connections between attrition and true charity by way of the imperfect love the former includes or connotes, is a very salutary result of the long, often bitter, wrangling of by-gone centuries, and more proximately of the voluminous recent discussion on the nature of the love that precedes justification.[18] On the latter point, at least, theologians still follow their divergent ways but none of them, we think, would seriously question that from attrition to contrition the step cannot be long or difficult.[19] Thank God, we have come a long way indeed from the days when eminent theologians were

---

[19]Thus Billot, who represents an intransigent attritionism far enough removed from the thought of St. Thomas, has written words we should never forget: "supposita voluntate a peccato aversa . . . facillimum est deinde ascendere ad cor altum, assumendo motivum caritatis" (De Virt. Inf. p. 415).

[17]"actus penitentiae a timore servili procedit sicut a primo motu affectus ad hoc ordinante: a timore filiali sicut ab immediato et proximo principo" (S. Th. 3 P. q. 85 a, 5).

[18]St. Alphonsus was well aware of the importance and value of imperfect love in the act of attrition—he who has this love, he assures us, "caritatem iam incipit habere" (n. 442 in fine).

making even sacramental justification unduly difficult by requiring a sorrow in which interested motives had little part.

4. Does sacramental absolution dispense with the need of perfect contrition in justification?

In view of the certainty that attrition suffices for fruitful absolution, one would be inclined to answer the above question in the affirmative, and such, in fact, is the answer of the great majority of modern theologians. The truth of that answer is, nevertheless, open to grave question, as we shall see by considering the main tendencies[20] of theological thought concerning the relation of contrition, perfect or imperfect, and absolution.

1st Tendency.—Sacramental absolution is intended, and that primarily, to supplement the inadequacy of attrition.[21]

Thus a person with attrition only, passes to a state of justification through sacramental absolution without any actual change in his will. He has the same kind of imperfect sorrow both before and after, and attrition plus absolution is seen to have the same justifying efficacy as contrition by itself. Thus the formula used by theologians to describe the justification of the sinner through the Sacrament of Penance—"ex attrito fit contritus"—does not mean that absolution is the principle of an act of perfect contrition or, still less, that it changes attrition itself into contrition, but that absolution gives to the former the force of the latter, or that, since grace and charity are now in the soul, the penitent is now habitually contrite though not actually.[22]

This approach has a definite answer to our question—sacramental absolution dispenses with the need of (the act) of perfect contrition for justification.

From a pastoral standpoint this emphasises on the need for absolution has much to recommend it: yet the sharp contrast between the efficacy of absolution and the inefficacy of attrition has, possibly, helped to maintain the prejudice against the ease and frequency of perfect contrition.[23] One salutary effect it has had is to bring into relief the Wonderful Mercy of God in providing for man's impotence. With actual grace he can, indeed, rise from sin through contrition, but there is an easier and a surer way. He need not strive after contrition, which might

---

[20]We say "tendencies" because it is not always possible to find the views of various authors expressed in words.

[21]cfr. Doronzo, v. 2 p. 151. This tendency can be recognised in most manuals.

[22]cfr. Merkelbach. v. 3 n. 503.

[23]cfr. n. 20.

elude him and about whose existence he could deceive himself: attrition with the sacrament suffices.

This approach, however, is of Scotistic rather than of directly Thomistic inspiration[24] and, inasmuch as it is sometimes put forward under the patronage of the Angelic Doctor, does not do justice to his thought on the Sacrament of God's Mercy, or reflect the mild and consoling doctrine he expounded on the sinner's reconciliation with Almighty God.

2nd Tendency.—Sacramental absolution is principally or largely intended to produce, where necessary, the act of contrition along with justifying grace, and thus carry over the attrite sinner to justification.[25]

There is no doubt that for St. Thomas the efficacy of sacramental absolution is such that, if a penitent is sufficiently disposed by sovereign attrition, it will not only give him sanctifynig grace, but will, at the same time, produce in him, supposing his co-operation, the proximate disposition to this grace—perfect contrition or a perfect act of charity. He says, for example: "quandoque contingit quod aliqui non perfecte contriti, *virtute clavium gratiam contritionis consequuntur*, dummodo non ponant obicem Spiritui Sancto".[26]

In this view the Scholastic formula—"ex attrito fit contritus"—receives an apt and satisfying explanation. As every agent produces, along with the form it effects, some disposition, called the "dispositio proxima" present, in point of time, as the very same moment as the form itself, but logically anterior to it,[27] so does absolution produce grace only in producing, at the same time, its appropriate proximate disposition, which is none other than the act of perfect contrition.[28] Thus the attrite penitent becomes contrite *"vi absolutionis"*[29], i.e., he

---

[24]cfr. Poschmann ibid. p. 98-103.

[25]vg. Garrigou — Lagrange, O.P., Boyer, S.J., Daffara, O.P., Diekamp-Hoffman.

[26]Quodl. iv. q. vii art. x.

[27]i.e. anterior considered as a disposition: as a property of the new form it follows it.

[28]In saying that contrition is the effect of absolution we must remember that according to the more probable opinion its immediate cause is sanctifying grace and charity considered not as inhering forms, but as efficient moving principles with the sinner's co-operation turning his will from sin and back to God. cfr. S. Th. 1: 2ae. q. 65. aa. 3, 5: 3P. q. 85, a. 6. ad. 3, Garrigou-Lagrange, De Eucharistia et Penitentia. p. 362.

[29]Naturally, if the penitent has contrition before absolution, this latter, as the sacramental sign along with the acts of penitent, will produce more abundant sorrow more and abundant grace. cfr. Daffara, Curs. Theol. Dogm. De Sacramentis, p. 500.

elicits a new act of sorrow, informed by grace and charity, which by definition is perfect contrition.[30]

When treating of St. Thomas' concept of attrition and contrition, we shall try to make clear that this explanation of the passage from attrition to contrition is perfectly well founded. In general, this second tendency seems open to criticism, not in what it asserts so much as in what it does not assert, or, perhaps more fairly, what it does not emphasise—namely, that, normally, perfect contrition precedes absolution and, though not absolutely required before absolution, it rather than attrition is the principal material part of the Sacrament.

Obviously the answer given by this approach to our question is that, so far from dispensing with the need of contrition, absolution has the function of actually producing it in cases where it is lacking.

3rd Tendency.—Contrition and sacramental absolution have a necessary relation to each other as sacramental matter and sacramental form —hence perfect contrition must always co-exist with absolution, normally or certainly more frequently preceding it in time, but, where mere attrition precedes, being produced by absolution itself, as explained above.[31]

This tendency represents a fuller and profounder attempt to expound the doctrine of St. Thomas on the causality of the Sacrament and virtue of Penance, and so goes beyond the second tendency without essentially contradicting it.

For St. Thomas it was perfectly clear that not only the Sacrament, but also the virtue of Penance, through its primary act, contrition, has the power to forgive mortal sin committed after Baptism. He was equally convinced that each is a necessary means of forgiveness, i.e., one cannot choose either way, but somehow the sinner must come back to God both by being contrite and by receiving absolution. Lastly, he did not doubt that the penitent, who presents himself for absolution already contrite, is already in the state of grace.

---

[30]In the exceptional case where a dying, unconscious man or one completely distracted is absolved, sanctifying grace will be received at the moment of absolution, and with it an habitual disposition to grace in infused penance. The act of contrition will follow normally if he recovers consciousness, vg. if he approves the absolution received. cfr. S. Th. De Ver. q. 28 a. 2. Flick. l. cit. p. 182-193.

[31]Thus, apparently with minor differences, Goettler, Schultes, O.P., De Vooght, O.S.B. (in two noteworthy articles in Ephem. Theol. Lovanienses, 1928, p. 224: 1930, p. 663), De Letter, S.J., in Theol Studies, Dec. 1946, Mar. 1950, Dondaine, O.P., L'Attrition Suffisante (Bibliotheque Thomiste, 1943, p. 46-60), Flick S.J., L'Attimo della Giustificazione secondo S. Tommasso, p. 173-180, Henry, O.P., Initiation Theologique v. iv., 1954, p. 620-644.

His solution was to regard contrition and absolution as component parts of one complete process of forgiveness, teaching that through its externalised acts the virtue of Penance is sacramental matter and is through the form or absolution elevated to signify and cause along with the latter the sacramental effect, which is the remission of sin. Hence, in speaking of the effects of Penance, he attributes these effects to both Sacrament and virtue.[32]

However, the external acts of the penitent will be valid sacramental matter only when they truly manifest their corresponding internal sentiments: just as valid matter for Baptism must be true water, not what looks like water. Thus interior contrition must be really there. In other words, there is from divine institution a necessary, perhaps an intrinsic, relation between contrition, even purely internal, and sacramental absolution, which is fundamentally the relation between matter and form in the one sacramental entity. If before absolution and even without being externalised, contrition justifies, it is because it has of its nature a quasi-sacramental power. It is what theologians and even the Council of Trent can be taken to mean when they teach that its power of justifying is only "ex voto sacramenti". Thus St. Thomas says: "Remissio culpae est effectus poenitentiae, principalius quidem ex virtute clavium . . .; secundario autem ex vi actuum poenitentis pertinentium ad virtutem poenitentiae, *tamen prout hi actus aliqualiter ordinantur ad claves Ecclesiae.* (3P. q.86 a.6.)[33]

This is only a particular application of the fundamental teaching that all grace and sanctification come to us in essential dependance on Christ, the One Mediator. Contrition cannot, therefore, justify unless it includes a movement of living Faith towards Him, the power of His Passion, and the efficacy of the wonderful and necessary instrument of justification called the Sacrament of Penance.[34]

For St. Thomas, then, the existence of the Sacrament of Penance does not dispense with the need of contrition for justification, but rather the contrary. Any other assumption would be like saying that the use of the form in Baptism dispenses with the necessity of pouring the

---

[32]3P q. 54. art. 1, 2, 6.

[33]"Contritio igitur, si secundum se consideratur, non se habet ad gratiam nisi per modum dispositionis; sed si consideretur inquantnm habet virtutem clavium in voto, *sic sacramentaliter operatur in virtute sacramenti poenitentiae*" (De Ver. 28. 8. ad 2).

[34]"ad passionem Christi ordinatur actus poenitentiae virtutis et per fidem et per ordinem ad claves Ecclesiae. Et ideo utroque modo causat remissionem culpae virtute passionis Christi" (3P. q. 86, 6 ad 3).

water. He is quite consistent with himself when he requires for sacramental matter not only the acts of the penitent, but *acts of the virtue* of penance.[35] Over and over again he says that contrition is part of the sacrament, while he never says this of mere attrition.

When a sinner goes to confession he must then try to excite himself to perfect contrition. The apparent rigour of this obligation is easily explained when we remember that for the Angelic Doctor any sovereign detestation for sin from a supernatural motive is, in practice, very likely to be contrition and, if not, will certainly be on the verge of it.[36] In this latter case the power of absolution will carry the penitent over to the act of contrition: hence the requisite matter will be there, produced as well as sacramentally informed, by the absolution itself.[37]

Verbally, St. Thomas seems to support the contritionist position,[38] but there is actually a world of difference between his "contritionism" and the semi-Jansenistic variety of it so strenuously combatted by St. Alphonsus and other opponents of rigorism. To understand this, we shall now say something of the sharp difference between St. Thomas' concept of the efficacy of absolution and the distinction between attrition and contrition, on the one hand, and the concept of these things that is assumed by very many modern authors, on the other.

5. *Thomistic and post-Thomistic concept of efficacy of absolution, attrition, contrition.*

(*a*) *Absolution*:

A stock argument of modern theology in refutation of contritionism runs something like this: Penance, which is a sacrament of the dead, would not remove sin "ex opere operato" if it presupposed perfect contrition, since perfect contrition remits sin "ex opere operantis": hence contritionism deprives Penance of its very nature as a sacrament of the dead and is thus manifestly false.[39]

The above reasoning does not lack a certain inconclusiveness,

---

[35]cfr. texts cited above.

[36]In his little work—De Forma Absolutionis—St. Thomas says of the confessor—"eum non debet absolvere in quo signa contritionis non videt, per quam homo interius iustificatur a Deo culpa remissa" (ch. 2. Ed. Mandonnet, p. 168).

[37]cfr. supra under second tendency and quodil, iv, vii, art. 10 there cited. The Holy Doctor warns us against over anxiety in seeking signs of contrition (see next section).

[38]"Confessio praesupponit caritatem, quia iam vivus aliquis confitetur" (4 D 17 q. 3, art. 11 sol. ad. 2).

[39]cfr. Billot, De Ecc. Sacramentis, v. 2. p. 155-157: Galtier, De Penitentita, n. 391: Hervé, v. 4, n. 275: Damen, v. 2, n. 278, 2: Merkelbach, v. n. 499, 2 et auctores passim.

especially inasmuch as it supposes that, to be a sacrament of the dead, Penance must sometimes, at least, actually forgive sins at the moment of absolution. Otherwise, we are asked, of what use would absolution really be?

St. Thomas would not have been impressed by such reasoning, because it overlooks a factor he constantly kept in mind, namely that the Sacraments are instruments of God's Mercy whose inner reality is apprehended by faith alone. Therefore, unlike merely natural agents, they have no need to exist before they can operate. By faith the sinner can subject himself to their influence, as he can subject himself to the influence of Christ the Redeemer. This is the ultimate explanation of why contrition always justifies—"sacramenta agunt secundum quod sunt in voto".[40]

Absolution operates in perfect contrition on the plane of final causality and in that way Penance preserves its nature as a sacrament of the dead. This does not, however, imply that even when we consider it as a final cause we should forget that it is an efficient cause. Because it is an efficient cause of justifying grace and, by divine institution, a necessary one, it must be desired before a baptised sinner can obtain any forgiveness whatsoever.

The fact that absolution justifies the attrite sinner is not denied by the Angelic Doctor, but it is a consequence of his manner of conceiving Penance as the Sacrament of forgiveness and, more proximately, a consequence of his explanation of its power to forgive even when there only "in voto". He does not think of absolution as being primarily or ordinarily designed to justify one who is attrite, but because it has, and must have, an intrinsic efficient power to justify, justify it will wherever a sinner has by sovereign attrition removed the obstacle (obex) to the inflow of grace.

By denying the power of absolution to justify one who is attrite, the contritionist implicitly takes away from it all intrinsic power to justify at all, even on the plane of final causality—i.e., when had merely in voto. The ordinary argument given against them would be completely conclusive if, instead of insisting on the fact that according to the

---

[40]Quodl. 4, q. 7 a. 10. The whole passage runs: "sacramenta operantur ut instrumenta divinae misericordiae iustificantis . . . Et ideo quamvis res naturales non agant nisi praesentialiter adhibitae, sacramenta tamen agunt etiam secundum quod sunt in voto".

For faith as a condition of the efficacy of the Passion of our Lord and the Sacraments, cfr. S. Th. 3P. q. 47 a. 6ad 2 and Vonier—A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist, ch. 1.

contritionists, absolution always presupposes grace, it insisted rather that, according to them, it would have to lack all power of giving first grace even through the operation of perfect contrition.

(b) *Attrition and Contrition.*[41]

In distinguishing between contrition and attrition modern theologians tend to emphasise their respective motives—contrition is the kind of sorrow that arises from a motive of charity; attrition is the kind that arises from some supernatural motive inferior to the motive of charity.[42] This is not denied by St. Thomas, but his emphasis is elsewhere. He insists that contrition is sorrow for sin informed by charity, while attrition is supernatural sorrow not so informed. "Contritio ab attritione praecedenti non differt solum sec. intensionem doloris, sed sec. informationem gratiae; et ita contritio habet aliquem ordinem posterioritatis ad gratiam, quod non habet attritio".[43]

For an act or a virtue to be informed by charity means simply that the latter gives it its ordination to the Last Supernatural End.[44] Once charity is there every supernatural act will have this ordination or information, for the proper effect of charity is to give to the will a connatural ordination to God in His Supreme Amiability. When a man's actions are under the direction of his purely natural will, they necessarily tend towards some real or apparent good, for goodness as such is its formal object. In like manner, when the will is informed by charity, no supernatural act is possible unless charity informs it by ordaining it to the Last Supernatural End. Thus, whatever the proximate and conscious motive of supernatural sorrow for sin, provided grace be there, such sorrow will always be contrition, for its fundamental direction will always be impressed on it by charity. Thus St. Thomas says: "Omnis dolor de peccato in habente gratiam est contritio".[45]

Thus is explained how through absolution the merely attrite penitent passes from attrition to contrition without any conscious psycho-

---

[41]Full discussion of this point would involve a discussion of the very difficult problem of the difference between interested and disinterested love. This we shall not attempt but we refer merely to recent articles that have given great help—De Letter, S.J., Perf. Cont. and Perf. Charity (Th Studies Dec. 1946), Two concepts of Cont. and Attrit. (ibid. Mar 1950), Hope and Charity in S. Th. (Thomist, April, July, 1950): Philbin: Love of God as an Act of Will (Ir. Th. Quart. Jan. 1951), The Intellect's Part in Char. (ibid. Oct. 1951): Stevens, O.S.B. Disinterested Love of God (Thomist, July, Oct. 1953).

[42]cfr. Hervé, 260, 268.

[43]De Ver. q. 28 a. 8 ad 2 cfr. Suppl. q. 1. aa. 2, 3,

[44]S.T. 2: 2ae. q. 23 aa 7, 8.

[45]De Ver. ibid. cor.

logical change. As De Letter well says: "There is hardly ever a perfect parallelism between the psychological awareness of what is in us, and the ontological reality of our spiritual dispositions".[46]

Just as the transition from attrition to contrition that takes place "vi absolutionis" need not be, and ordinarily is not, the object of any conscious experience, neither is the transition that takes place, as for St. Thomas it ordinarily does, before absolution or maybe without absolution ever being received—vg., if a man never gets the opportunity to confess, or is in invincible ignorance of his obligation to do so. In other words, a sinner who commences his journey back to God impelled by the fear of Hell or some other interested, but supernatural, motive inferior to charity, need not, in order to become contrite, conceive a sorrow for sin consciously motivated by disinterested love of God. Charity and, therefore, contrition is present the moment his will adheres to God the Last Supernatural End, infinitely Good in Himself.[47] He may still be very conscious of a fear of Hell and a desire to escape its punishments, but this need not rule out a true act of charity. The latter can be present inasmuch as the disinterested motive of love provided by the Goodness of God in Himself can be lurking in a hidden and subconscious way in the midst of motives of fear and interested love. The true presence of this disinterested love seems, in fact, to make even desire of God, or what is usually called the love of concupiscence, a true, if secondary, act of charity and thus the sorrow it informs is true contrition.[48]

---

[46]Theological Studies, March, 1950, p. 30, n. 99.

[47]"Caritas habet pro obiecto ultimum finem humanae vitae, scil. beatitudinis obiectum" (2: 2ae. q. 23. a. 4. ad 2).

[48]The test as to whether a man desires God and heavenly goods from charity or some less perfect love seems to be whether interested motives have an, at least, implicit ordination to God, as the Supreme Good in Himself. The great masters of theology and the spiritual life know nothing of a charity, however elevated, that excludes of its nature all interested motives or in which desire for God must not play a prominent part. The idea of God as man's "summum bonum" dominates the entire spirituality of St. Augustine: St. Thomas explicitly says that God's benefits are disposing causes of charity (2: 2 ae, q. 27 a 3), and teaches that the supreme degree of charity is "ut homo principaliter intendat ut Deo inhaereat et eo fruatur", like St. Paul (2: 2 ae. q. 24 a 9).

St. Alphonsus is completely in this tradition. He strongly defends the position that desire to posses God and love of Him as "bonum conveniens nobis" are acts of charity, i.e. diligendo divinam bonitatem tanquam nobis convenientem, eo quod ipsa nos adiuvat ad Dei voluntatem implendam et consequendum ultimum nostrum finem" (1, 2 n. 246. G. p. 316-7). In Practica d'Amare he agrees with St. Francis de Sales who says we could never love God unless He communicated Himself to us. (ch. 16, 5), cfr. Treatise on Div. Love, bk. 10, ch. 10: De Letter (in Thomist 1950. p. 231-248, Philbin (Ir. Th. Quar. 1953, 1-23) Garrigou-Lagrange-De Virt. p. 387, De Guibert, Theol. Spiritualis, n. 365-367.

Concluding Pastoral Observations.[49]

There is, then, diversity, sometimes apparent but sometimes real in the way theologians expound the efficacy of sacramental Penance and such diversity is extended to the nature of contrition itself and to the relation of the love of concupiscence to theological charity. It might seem that the preacher and confessor will be in a sorry plight in their important pastoral responsibilities—the former in propounding instructions that express doctrine and not just theological opinions or, at least, only those opinions that are safe in practice and salutary, the latter in administering the Sacrament of Penance with all possible leniency and all possible fruit. In reality this need not be so, since in vitally important points of practice various lines of theological thought converge to fairly general agreement.

Nevertheless, doctrine and doctrinal convictions are never without their impact on practice. We propose to show how a grasp of the Thomistic synthesis of the virtue and Sacrament will be a sure guide for both preacher and confessor, giving both of them a sound approach to burning pastoral problems of both pulpit and confessional.[50]

1. The Pulpit.

(*a*) *Instruction on contrition.*

No theologian these days would contend that perfect contrition is of any greater practical difficulty than other supernatural acts if one uses the ordinary helps of divine grace.[51] How important it is that people should be instructed in this needs no emphasising.

It is clear that the zealous pastor who is trained in the school of St. Thomas will do just this. The Angelic Doctor says there is no forgiveness of mortal sin without perfect contrition—if a person comes to confession merely attrite, absolution will make him contrite. The preacher will tell people, then, always to try to have the greatest possible sorrow for their sins, and that confession itself is useless without true sorrow.

He will also tell them that sincere efforts to be sorry will almost always lead to perfect contrition, and thus they need not, and should not, wait till confession before their sins are actually forgiven. For

---

[49]cfr. De Letter, Theol. Studies, March, 1950, p. 26-33.

[50]The value of the great theologians, and hence of St. Thomas before all others, consists not so much in the fact that have founded or represent particular schools as in what they have done to establish and illuminate common teaching. Profound and original as is the theological thought of the Angelic Doctor, a study of him on any point almost inevitably leads us back to traditional positions viewed from within. Thus he is the "Doctor Communis" (Pius XI, "Studiorum Ducem". AAS, 1923, p. 314).

[51]cfr. authors cited by A. Brennan, C.SS.R., in ACR 1947, p. 278-279.

perfect contrition we must be sorry because our sins have offended God Who is so good in Himself, but that does not mean our love for Him has to be wholly or even explicitly disinterested. God is the One Who showers benefits on us and gives abundant helps to reach Heaven: He is Love Itself,[52] One Whose Friendship is most desirable and is to be desired above all others. To have perfect contrition all that is necessary is to be sorry that our sins have separated us from One Who is the only Source of true happiness, Whose friendship we now value above all, and Whose Will we wish to fulfil.[53]

Important, too, is the Thomistic approach in helping us to lay salutary stress on the role of attrition. Beyond doubt, people should be told clearly and emphatically that sovereign attrition is sufficient in the Sacrament, but with equal clarity and emphasis it should be brought home to them not to be content with attrition alone, even when going to confession.[54]

Perhaps modern theologians have so emphasised this sufficiency of attrition that we lose sight of a very important truth, which pastors should not forget themselves or allow their people to forget—that the chief value of imperfect sorrow or contrition is to prepare the penitent for perfect sorrow or contrition.[55] Sovereign attrition, no matter how much it is inspired by fear of Hell, includes initial love: in salutary fear of God as the Supreme Judge and Avenger there is necessarily

---

[52]cfr. letter of Fr. de la Taille, S.J., to Archd. Sheehan published in ACR Jan. 1926 (p. 84-85), where it is also pointed out that contrition is not more difficult than mere attrition.

[53]One might object that it is only probable that the love of concupiscence can be an act of charity, and that to tell people sorrow for sin inspired by such love is contrition is unsafe. Perhaps explicitly disinterested love is required, and if so, people will be deceived in a manner of vital moment for their eternal salvation.

To this we can say (i) the idea that love of concupiscence does not belong to charity seems unfounded in tradition and came into theology through Scotus and Suarez (cfr. De Letter in The Thomist ibid); (ii) no Catholic holds that charity in this life excludes interested love; to do so would be semi-quietism (Denz. n. 1327); (iii) all concede that the love of concupiscence whether it belongs to hope or charity can lead to and be the instrument of disinterested love; (iv) the safety of an opinion must also be estimated according to its practical fruits. To tell people that to have perfect contrition they must strive for a consciously disinterested love is to discourage them: to tell them they can reach perfect contrition from interested motives is to encourage their efforts and in those efforts very many will succeed.

[54]cfr. S. Alphonsus. On Preaching, p. 2, Instruction ch. 5. n. 2.

[55] 'Attritio dicit accessum ad perfectam contritionem" (Suppl. q. la. 2 ad 2). St. Thomas finds confirmation of this in the very derivation of the words: "in corporalibus dicuntur 'attritia' quae aliquo modo diminuta sunt sed non perfecte; sed 'contritio dicitur quando omnes partes tritae sunt simul per divisionem ad minima" (ibid).

love of Him as the infinitely Good Liberator, and if such love is not necessarily charity, nobody can tell the exact moment when it passes into charity. People should be told if they are sorry for having offended God as the greatest of evils, and keep trying to be as sorry as possible, their sorrow will ordinarily become perfect.

(*b*) *Instruction on necessity and fruits of confession.*

Insistence on the efficacy, necessity, and ease of perfect contrition in the line of authentic Thomastic thought will not lead us to underestimate the necessity and value of the Sacrament. In fact, our instructions will emphasise these very things, for even in extra-sacramental contrition we will see an anticipated working of the sacrament itself, because for St. Thomas contrition of its nature operates on a quasi-sacramental level. This means we shall insist on the need for confession as required by the very Will of God, and propose readiness to confess as a necessary test of the sincerity of contrition.

Again the very uncertainty of the moment when contrition is reached shows that, although with God's help it is reasonably easy, it is always possible to think we have perfect sorrow when, in fact, it is only imperfect. The Sacrament removes this uncertainty, guaranteeing forgiveness, and, in any case, making our sorrow more abundant. It always removes us still further from sin, and this is a reason why frequent confession is so much commended to those who wish to lead a devout and holy life.[56]

The adequate pastoral approach is to insist that true sorrow for sin requires practice of the virtue and diligent use of the Sacrament—neither being so emphasised as either in theory or practice to diminish the necessity and value of the other. This approach we shall have if, with the Angelic Doctor, we regard both one and the other as indispensable and complementary factors in the whole process of forgiveness.

2. The Confessional.

(*a*) *Judging dispositions.*

Although St. Thomas considers contrition should precede absolution, he presupposes that the external signs of contrition in its lower stages do not differ from those of attrition and, in practice, would judge a penitent contrite once it is clear he has sovereign detestation of sin. This is a consequence of his idea that the transition to perfect contrition does not normally involve any psychological change. Thus the confessor who follows his teaching need demand only those signs of

[56]cfr. Pius XII on frequent confession in "Mys. Corporis" (AAS, 1943, p. 235)—quoted also by Damen v. 2. n. 275 bis (ed. 15 and 16).

sorrow that are required by even the mildest of modern theologians.[57]

(*b*) *Problems of recidives and occasionaries.*

In dealing with these often very perplexnig cases, St. Thomas' teaching that, even in the Sacrament, perfect contrition is required for forgiveness, at least as the effect of absolution will help us to follow the prudent and salutary rules laid down by St. Alphonsus. Attrition and contrition may not involve any necessary difference on the level of psychological consciousness, but they are profoundly different on the deeper level of ontological reality. If we hold that no one is justified without contrition—an act informed by and containing all the power of theological charity—we shall require more of the penitent in his subsequent conduct than if we assume mere attrition, an act denuded of the power of charity, will do.

Thus if an habitual sinner has been property instructed by the confessor and makes an act of perfect contrition, either before absolution or as it is completed, it is not to be expected that there will be—apart from extenuating circumstances—hardly any perceptible effort to improve, and, if there is actually no such effort, one is prone to suspect that his contrition was not really sincere. Thus we rejoin the teaching of St. Alphonsus on the obligation of a confessor to seek extraordinary signs of contrition from a formal recidive and to try to produce such signs by suitable exhortations. It may well be that over insistence on the sufficiency of mere attrition for absolution, and a concomitant tendency to assume that absolution justifies in a more or less mechanical way, has, consciously or otherwise, led some theologians to set aside the prudent norms laid down by St. Alphonsus in this matter.[58]

Something similar applies to occasionaries. If we consider that they must have actual contrition to be justified, we will require more of them than if we absolutely assume the sufficiency of mere attrition. We will, with St. Alphonsus, impose on them, if we prudently can, the obligation of avoiding occasions in which they will probably fall into serious sin, not only because prudence imposes it, but also because a contrite penitent should normally be strong enough to fulfil the obligation. Here once again we rejoin the salutary wisdom of St. Alphon-

---

[57]cfr. 3P, q. 80 a. 4 ad. 5.

[58]Thus it is probably no accident that Ballerini, the resolute opponent of St. Alphonsus in this question, accepted and went beyond the Scotist position that the entire essence of the Sacrament of Penance is in the absolution (Opus Morale v. 5, p. 6). The penitent's co-operation is reduced to the very minimum compatible with Catholic teaching, if even that. Some regard the Ballerini position as temerarious (cfr. Doronzo. De Penit. v. 1. p. 175).

sus, who admonishes us that where there is danger of formal sin, the correct opinion to follow is that one, usually, which best guarantees it will be avoided.

(*c*) *Advice, exhortations.*

The admonition offered to a confessor not to be an absolving machine is always opportune. He must be ready to exhort penitents to co-operate with the sacrament— admonishing, advising, exciting to deeper sorrow. The more a penitent practises the virtue of penance when receiving the Sacrament, the more effective is the Sacrament itself going to be—for Divine Wisdom and Divine Mercy have wonderfully blended both in the one supernatural reality.

No one has grasped this so clearly as the Angelic Doctor. The masterly synthesis he has made between virtue and sacrament is, when considered on a pastoral level, a sure guide for those charged with pastoral responsibility. It is full of the mildness of the Gospel itself, and opens the path of salvation to many, but that path is never allowed to become broad enough to be, in reality, the road to perdition.

A. REGAN, C.SS.R.

* * * *

SCHRIFTEN ZUR THEOLOGIE (2nd volume), by Karl Rahner, S.J.; Benziger Verlag; Einsiedeln, Switzerland; 399 pp.

Already the first volume of this important collection of theological essays has been reviewed (A.C.R., July, 1955, pp. 276f.). In this second volume Professor Rahner discusses such widely different themes as the Mystical Body, personal and sacramental holiness, indulgences, the sacrament of Penance, the resurrection of the body, the lay-apostolate, "situation-ethics". In general, the same high excellence, the same depth and originality mark the essays of this second series, as marked the first. Perhaps particularly noteworthy for its painstaking dogmatic exposition is the study of membership of the Church in the light of Pius XII's "Mystici Corporis Christi" (7-95). The essays on Indulgences (185-211) and on the resurrection of the flesh (211-227) well illustrate Fr. Rahner's freshness of approach, his ability to show the actuality of ancient dogmas. Those interested to sample in English the quality of these writings will be glad to note a précis of one of them ("Personal and Sacramental Sanctity") in THEOLOGY DIGEST, 1955, 93-98.

Indices for both Fr. Rahner's volumes appear at the back of this second one.

J.P.K.

Archdeacon John McEncroe, VIII
(1795-1868)

Summary: Unsatisfactory condition of the Church in the difficult gold-rush period of the 'fifties—Allegations of "general stagnation"—Fr. McEncroe writes to Holy See suggesting remedies—His proposals shelved for time being—Discontent among members of Benedictine community—Cause of discontent referred to Rome—Hurried departure of Drs. Polding and Gregory for Rome—Death of Bishop Davis and appointment of Fr. McEncroe as acting Vicar General—Pastorals in connection with some important events—Return of Archbishop—Fr. McEncroe again in correspondence with Archbishop of Dublin.

"A laudatory account of Catholicity in N.S.W. would be laughed at by any sensible person in Sydney. But a candid opinion of the needs of the mission would land a person in hot water . . . The Archbishop is a good prelate, but unfortunately he is not blessed with very superior counsellors." That Father Patrick Newman (pastor of historic St. Patrick's, Church Hill, just on a hundred years ago), from whose cautious letter to a friend in Dublin we venture to print this significant passage, was not at all exaggerating the unsatisfactory condition of ecclesiastical affairs during the critical gold-rush period of the 'fifties is proved only too well by similar observations of Bishop Goold's and other reliable contemporary witnesses. Though the letter does not say so in so many words, it is easy to read between the lines that the counsellor held chiefly responsible for the "general stagnation" was Dr. Gregory Abbot of the Monastery and Vicar-General of the diocese, whose harsh methods of implementing the Archbishop's dream of an exclusively Benedictine Church had been producing of late, nothing but one disastrous result after another. Due to his continual pin-pricking the three Christian Brothers, for whom Father McEncroe had been imploring the Archbishop of Dublin as far back as 1832, had closed down their school and gone home; the Sisters of Charity, long subjected to similar annoying interference with the cherished rules of their Constitution, had reluctantly dispersed, some returning to Ireland, others finding an appreciative field for their generous labours in Hobart; serious dissension among the Brethren of the Monastery was fast coming to a head, while allegations of unfair discrimination against the secular clergy, appearing in the Dublin's *Freeman's Journal*, was keeping at a mere trickle the hoped for flow of young priests from the new Foreign Missionary College of All Hallows and other Irish

seminaries. And all this, be it remembered, at a time when the Catholic population was showing signs of not only doubling but trebling.

Torn between two impulses—one to catch the first ship out of the Harbour and end his missionary career where he had commenced it—on the American mission, and the other to remain in Australia and use all his energies to break the deadlock, Father McEncroe sat down to his desk and, apparently without any consultation with the Archbishop, composed what must be considered one of the most extraordinary letters ever written by a simple priest. It was addressed to no less a personage than the great Pope Pius IX himself and was prompted by no other motive than "the desire to save my Catholic countrymen in Australia, who are perishing for want of priests."

"Most Holy Father,

Amidst your manifold cares, be pleased to read some remarks on a subject dear to your heart, that of supplying the foreign missions of Australia with priests.

Having spent seven years with Monseigneur England, Bishop of Charleston, United States of America, and nineteen years on this mission of Australia, and not expecting to have many more years to devote to the duties of the ministry, I feel a very deep interest in the spiritual welfare of the Catholics of New South Wales, and wish to see them provided with priests before I die or leave Australia.

I am under many obligations to His Grace Monseigneur Polding—he has patiently borne with my faults in past years, and by his paternal advice assisted me in correcting them—he has shown his confidence in me, by appointing me the Archdeacon and Chancellor of his Diocese; he is a most zealous Bishop, and has done much for religion in this immense region. The remarks I am then going to make do not proceed from any want of reverence towards him, but from a desire to save my Irish Catholic countrymen in Australia, who are perishing for want of priests.

I thought once with the Archbishop that he could supply the Diocese with priests from the Benedictine monastery he established in Sydney. It may do so, in twenty or thirty years, but not before then; and in the meantime, the faith will be nearly extinguished in the numerous Irish Catholics, and their children will grow up without any religion, become indifferent, or turn Protestants.

As in all new colonies, so in this, few subjects can be found for the 'priesthood' for many years to come—a few priests may be procured from the Catholic countries of Europe, but it is from *Ireland* they should

naturally be provided for this mission; as 95 out of every 100 Catholics in all these colonies are *Irish,* or of Irish descent. Some years ago Irish students and priests did come to labour under Dr. Polding, but at present, very few, if any, can be found to come from Ireland to the Archdiocese of Sydney. Your Holiness may ask 'what is the reason they will not come *now* as heretofore?' The reason is, they have heard that Archbishop intends to supply his mission with Benedictine monks, and that the Irish clergy will be employed only as *assistants* to the English Benedictines; and to act as 'tithe collectors' for the monastery. The attempts made by the Archbishop to take a *percentage* from the *stipends paid* by the Government to the *secular priests,* and, *afterwards, the two kinds of the dues and offerings* made by the faithful to the clergy for the support of his mission and monastery, created a very strong feeling amongst the Irish clergy and laity against the Archbishop and the Benedictines. It is true he has given up these demands—yet the attempt has produced an unfavourable impression in Ireland regarding the Archdiocese of Sydney. The following fact will show the existence of that impression. Some time ago I sent £60 to the Archbishop of Cashel—my native Diocese—and promised to send £60 every year towards the education of a few ecclesiastics for the Diocese of Sydney, the candidates to be chosen and sent to college by the Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel, but as yet not a single candidate can be found to accept my offer. One who was recommended by his parish priest and a relative friend of mine, and who had spent four years in college, refused to come to Sydney, but was willing to go to America. The Irish have suffered so much from England that they have in general a dislike to be under the best of English Catholic Bishops. Thus, while Irish ecclesiastics will come willingly to the Diocese of Adelaide and Melbourne, because they are governed by Irish Bishops—*hardly any one can be* found at present to come to the Archdiocese of Sydney, though there are much better means *here* for *their support* than in either Adelaide or Melbourne.

What I would then most respectfully suggest, in order to remove this obstacle to Irish ecclesiastics coming to the Australian mission, would be, Most Holy Father, to make two or three new Vicariates-Apostolic out of the present immense region under the jurisdiction of Dr. Polding—one to the south, one to the west, and one to the north of the central Vicariate of Sydney. The one to the south to be bounded by the Vicariate of Melbourne on the south, and by a 'line' from the mouth of the Shoalhaven River, in about 35° S. latitude—running nearly parallel to the boundary of the Melbourne Vicariate to the Lachlan

River; in about 30° 30' near the Goulburn range, and then along the Lachlan to the western boundary of the Vicariate of Melbourne on the River Murray. The populous town of Goulburn having a good church to be made the *Bishop's See* for this Vicariate. The one to the west of the Blue Mountains to have the large town of Bathurst as the Bishop's See. This district has a numerous Catholic population. The Vicariate of the north of Sydney, to be bounded by the 30th Parallel of latitude—as the Government intend to divide this district from New South Wales, and to the north of it, to Wide Bay, in 24° latitude—having the increasing town of Brisbane with its church as the Bishop's See. There are from 12,000 to 16,000 Catholics in *each of these districts—as many as in all New South Wales when Dr. Polding was appointed Vicar-Apostolic.* This would leave five degrees—300 miles in length, and the same in depth—from the sea coast to the western boundary of South Australia, a very extensive district, for the central Vicariate of Sydney, to remain under the care of Monseigneur Polding and the Benedictines. If Irish Bishops be appointed for these new Vicariates, I have no doubt, Most Holy Father, but they will soon find priests to assist them, and those thousands of souls will receive the Holy Sacraments, who are now, literally, perishing for want of any one to break to them the Bread of Life. Even many children remain without Baptism. If an Irish Bishop had been appointed for Hobart Town, I think the dissensions and scandals that have taken place from the dispute between Monseigneur Willson and Father Therry would have been avoided, and that religion would be *there* in a much better state than it is at present. Unfortunately the Irish and English characters are very different in their nature, and when any difference takes place between an English Bishop and an Irish priest, then national antipathies and mutual distrusts spring up, and prevent a proper understanding, and thus perpetuate bad feelings. In my opinion very few Englishmen know how to guide or govern Irishmen, whether lay or ecclesiastical.

It may be said that Monseigneur Polding had to reject some Irish ecclesiastics as unfit for the mission. This is true, but he had to reject as many English and other subjects of his Benedictine Order. Such, alas! is the infirmity of human nature, that some cadidates for Holy Orders in every country and every religious institution will be found unfit for the sacred ministry. But I am satisfied that if Monseigneur Polding had employed half the time, pains, and expense, that he has laid out on founding his Order in New South Wales, in training up Irish students and others for his mission, he would ere this have had his

Diocese better provided for. His monastery cannot do much for many years to come, and the few priests he has are quite insufficient—and broken down as they are with labour—and very dissatisfied that fellow labourers are not being provided to share the toil with them in their too extensive and laborious missions.

You may remark, Most Holy Father, that it belongs to the Archbishop, and not to me, to make this statement; perhaps so. It is not indeed my Province, but, like 'Jethro' of old, I presume to inform the leader of the people, 'that he ought not to consume himself with imprudent labour, not to undertake what is above his strength, but that he ought to seek for a sufficient number of persons to assist him in the great work he has in hand.' This I have done to the best of my poor understanding, and if I have said anything amiss, I humbly beg pardon for it. *Ex abundantia cordis locutus sum.* My wish is, that the people should not perish. The infant Benedictine monastery at Sydney cannot supply their wants—Ireland alone can do so, in my opinion, as stated above. In making this statement *liberavi animam meam, et peto ut nunc dimittas, SS. Pater servum tuum in pace.*

It rests now with your Holiness, whom the Prince of Pastors has placed to 'feed the lambs and the sheep' of His entire flock, to adopt such measures, as the Holy Spirit may direct you to take, for providing sufficient pastors for the instruction of this fast increasing portion of the Lord's vineyard in this distant region of the earth.

Prostrate in spirit at the threshold of the Apostles, and at the feet of Peter in the person of Pius, I beg, most earnestly, your Holiness's blessing, and am your most humble and obedient servant and son in Jesus Christ.

J. McENCROE,
Archdeacon.

Dated at Sydney, 12th March, 1851.

To His Holiness Pius IX, Pope reigning at Rome."

His former assistant at St. Mary's, now the Bishop of Melbourne, being about to depart on his first *ad limina* to Rome, Father McEncroe did not neglect to enlist his valuable influence with the Holy See.

"Sydney, 1st March, 1851.

My Dear Lord,—

I have written to the Holy Father offering a few suggestions about supplying New South Wales with priests. It is obvious that the 'infant' Benedictine Monastery cannot. Irish students or priests will

not come. In this state, thousands must perish. I suggest that two new Dioceses be formed—one bounded by yours, and a 'line' from Shoalhaven to the Lachlan River at 33° lat., the other from lat. 30° to the north, including Moreton Bay, &c., both to be placed under 'Irish' Bishops who will soon get subjects from Ireland, the only country that can spare them. The Diocese of Sydney will have five degrees in width and will extend to the west, as far as South Australia —quite large enough. I begged to refer to your Lordship and to Dr. Gregory, if either should go to Rome, as to the necessity of these measures. I may be with my old friend Dr. Burnes in America before your return from Rome. His Lordship has invited me to end my days with him on the American mission—to which I have been always much attached. If we have 'steam' from Sydney to Panama, as expected, I wish at least to take a trip to see 'Brother Jonathan' once more, whether to remain there or not. Wishing you every blessing in your visit to Europe, and requesting a 'memento,'

I remain in haste,
My dear Lord,
Yours most faithfully,
J. McENCROE.

Right Rev. Dr. Goold."

Unfortunately, owing to a combination of regrettable circumstances, Father McEncroe's far-seeing proposals were doomed to be shelved for almost a decade. What with violent dissensions in Hobart and Perth and economic ruin threatening Adelaide, Rome could hardly be expected to look with favour on the creation of still more dioceses. But the matter was only postponed and in a subsequent chapter we shall again find the indefatigable priest and his good friend the Bishop of Melbourne, this time in Rome itself, successfully joining forces to win approval for their scheme.

Meanwhile, however, events of a serious nature were taking place in Sydney. On 19 March, 1854, the long simmering discontent among the Benedictine Brethren at St. Mary's finally came to a head when several members of the community, passing right over the head of the Archbishop, addressed a petition to the Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, wherein they set out their grievances under three heads. These were:

1. A Reclamation against our Solemn Religious Profession.
2. A most humble petition, if our vows be valid, for secularization.

3. A petition for the removal from all authority over us of Very Rev. Dr. Gregory, V.G., Prior.

In view of incidents that happened twelve years later, it is important to note that the signatures attached to the petition for the removal of Dr. Gregory were those of S. A. Sheehy and J. F. Sheridan (priests) and of J. H. Curtis (deacon).

The petitions, as has been stated, were signed on 19 March. Two days later the Archbishop and the Vicar-General departed hurriedly for Rome, leaving the diocese in the care of the Auxiliary Bishop, Dr. Davis, O.S.B. Two months later still, on 17th May, 1854, the saintly Dr. Davis died, whereupon the clergy of the archdiocese met and unanimously appointed Archdeacon McEncroe "acting Vicar-General" pending the return of the Archbishop (which did not take place until January, 1856).

What transpired in Rome is best told in the purposely vague language of Cardinal Moran: "During the Archbishop's stay in Rome, some resolutions taken by Propaganda appeared to him to be calculated to bring ruin on the whole fabric of the Church as built up by him on Benedictine lines for well nigh twenty years. He accordingly tendered his resignation of the See, and requested permission to spend the remainder of his days in the peace and repose of the cloister. The S.C. of Propaganda, whilst declining to accept the proferred resignation, conveyed to him its assurance of the fullest confidence in his diocesan administration" (Moran, p. 447). In refusing the Archbishop's resignation Rome may well have been influenced by reports from Sydney, where the acting Vicar General had convened a hurried meeting of clergy and laity to petition the Holy Father for the return to them of "their beloved chief pastor."

With the year 1854 is associated in a special way the terrible Crimean War, in which the spiritual daughters of Catherine McAuley played such a heroic and memorable part. In Australia, where the possibility of a Russian invasion of Sydney Harbour was not being overlooked, Father McEncroe considered the situation sufficiently serious to warrant the issue of a pastoral letter. "The Almighty," he warned, "permits now, as He did of old, the Enemy to come from the North to scourge His people for their sins. And we should, like the Catholic Princes and Pastors of other days, have recourse to the intercession of the Virgin Mother of God . . . . We have evidence in the pages of history that the Christian Armies obtained a decisive victory over their enemies at the memorable battle of Lepanto in 1571, when prayers

and supplications were made throughout the Catholic World to the Blessed Virgin to help them by her intercession . . . . Now in the present combat against the Northern Enemy, we are glad to find our Gracious Sovereign allied with the Emperor of Catholic France, who has placed his fleet and armies under the protection of the Queen of Heaven. So we may confidently hope that the Mother of God will aid by her prayers the combined forces of England and France, now engaged in a defensive war against the Emperor of Russia, who with his Greek Schismatics are as bitter enemies of the Catholics of Europe as the Sultan and Turk had ever been in past ages . . . ."

The advent of Responsible Government to N.S.W., also occurring during the period of his control of the diocese, elicited yet another important statement in which be dealt at great length with the subject of Education and reminded the faithful of their grave obligation "to vote for no candidate at the next election who will not promise to use his best efforts in the new Parliament to obtain for the Catholics of the colony a proportionate share of the educational grants for the support of schools, where the children shall be duly instructed in the principles of their Faith, while they are receiving the elements of a good secular education."

"Such another opportunity as the present," he warned, "may never again present itself to the Catholic electors of N.S.W. to secure the blessings of a sound Christian education for the rising generation. This our request is both reasonable and just. It is the principle already secured to us by Sir Richard Bourke's memorable Church Act—the charter of our civil and religious liberties, with regard to the building of churches and the support of the clergy. We ask no more, and we shall never be content with less with regard to the youth of our communion. To be silent or pusillanimous at the present momentous crisis, or to stand neutral when the best and dearest spiritual interests of the flock entrusted to our care are at stake, would argue, on our part, a want of zeal in support of that holy Faith for which our Catholic forefathers suffered such bitter persecution for the long period of 300 years . . . . ."

Two shorter pastorals belong also to this period: one emphasising the importance of the Apostolate of the Press and asking for a wider circulation of the *Freeman's Journal,* the other occasioned by the prolonged drought of 1854, which he regarded as a chastisement by God for the widespread sin of drunkenness. "The chastising hand of the Lord," he wrote, "seems to be extended with a menacing attitude

over the people of this country. The heavens have refused to give "the early and the latter rains—a drought with all its withering effects on the fruits of the earth, has fallen on us and we are threatened with a season of scarcity, if not of want . . . It is the usual course of God's Providence to punish sinners by withdrawing from them these gifts and blessings which they have used as the means of gratifying their vicious propensities by transgressing the Divine Commandments. Hence we may look upon the present drought as a just visitation of an angry God for the bad use made of His manifold favours . . . Let us implore the Father of Mercies to change and convert the minds and hearts of the countless drunkards in this country . . . I beg you, therefore, my zealous fellow-labourers in the Christian Vineyard, to preach in season and out of season against the vice of drunkenness, the curse of this country, the bane of society and the ruin of religion and of the souls of men."

The return at the end of January of Archbishop Polding, accompanied by Dr. Gregory (now, presumably Abbot only in name), was a joyous occasion. But it was very evident that the small band of three priests and two students, which he brought with him fell very short, in Father McEncroe's estimation, of the requirements. And thus we find him, less than three months afterwards, once more in correspondence with the all-powerful Archbishop of Dublin about "the inadequate supply of Prelates and priests for the daily increasing Catholic population of N.S.W."

11th April, 1856.

"My Dear Lord Archbishop,

I received in due course your Grace's letter of 14th October regarding the receipt of the bills for the relief of the soldiers' widows and orphans.

I beg now to refer to a case of far greater spiritual wants, the inadequate supply of Prelates and priests for the daily increasing Catholic population of New South Wales. I hereby enclose to your Grace a copy of a letter which I ventured to address to His Holiness in 1851 on the subject. As the Catholics have doubled within that period, and the number of efficient priests now on this immense mission is about the same as it was five years ago, viz., 35 or 37, and no increase, but a decrease in the Episcopal body, by the death of the excellent Dr. Davis, Bishop of Maitland, who although for four or five

years in Sydney, never saw Maitland, his proper See, but was always and well employed in Sydney as Coadjutor Bishop.

Although this is an English colony, yet it should be considered an affiliation from the Church of *Ireland*, as the great mass of the Catholics, both clergy and laity, are from that Island of Saints.[1] Hence, I feel authorised in writing to your Grace as delegate of the Pope to the Irish Church, in the hope that you may be pleased to show my letter to His Grace of Armagh, the successor of St. Patrick, and that both of you may consider how you might best bring the case before the Propaganda, and get additional Bishops appointed for Australia. For its is impossible for any one Prelate to visit and direct the congregations of a Diocese extending over one thousand miles from north to south, and 200 from east to west. There are three or four towns with more Catholics in each, and in the adjoining districts now, than were in all New Holland when Dr. Polding was appointed Vicar-Apostolic of the same in 1835. I was in this mission for three years before that period, and I know well its Catholic statistics. It is true the Archbishop has done much for this mission, but he cannot do impossibilities. I know he does not seem to like the idea of my proposing a division of his jurisdiction, but his jurisdiction is confined to Sydney as Archbishop, and he is Vicar-Apostolic of the territory beyond the limits of this city. I am convinced that the same evils will arise in Australia that did in America from the want of appointing in time a greater number of Bishops. Dr. England points out these evils in his letter written in Rome in 1826, and published in the third volume of his works. I have only one object in calling attention to this subject, and that is, a desire to provide the means of salvation for my countrymen in Australia. I am now past 60 years of age, I have no earthly motive in taking this step. I have, thank God, sufficient means for the

---

[1]Here we seem to detect almost an echo of the sentiments expressed by Dr. Ullathorne on his return from his "recruiting expedition" of 1838: "I have done nothing. I was but the empty vessel of reception for the gifts of God as they unexpectedly came from many quarters . . . To the enlightened hierarchy of Ireland we are under very great obligations. Whenever I met those venerable men, whether assembled or individually, I found but one sentiment in our regard. I went before them a stranger, they received me as a friend; I went among them as an Englishman, they received me as though I had been an Irishman. I went amongst them unknown, they saw but my cause and gave me their respect and unanimous co-operation. I had but one brief word to say: 'My Lord, our people were once your children, and the good father never forgets his children—our mission is but an appendage to the Church of Ireland'."

few remaining years of my life, and I would die in peace, if I saw two or three active and zealous Irish Bishops appointed to the Sees named in my letter to His Holiness. Pray for me, and excuse this great liberty that I take, but it is in a good cause.

Most faithfully yours,

J. McENCROE.

His Grace Archbishop Cullen."

(To be continued)

R. WYNNE.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

"RETREAT FOR THE SICK," Radio Talks, by Rev. Fr. Edmund, C.P. Second Series. Dublin. M. H. Gill & Son Ltd., 1954. 30 pages.

These were to be heard, rather than read, is the warning of the writer in his foreword. [Bearing this in mind, one expects a work of a simple logical fashion, which in fact it is.] The work comprises three conferences entitled, (1) Forgotten People, (2) The Holy Sacrifice, (3) Mary—Health of the Sick. Included in the publication are some prayers for the sick. The first conference is a practical endeavour to help his listening and reading audience form a christian outlook towards suffering. This idea he develops in the second, by urging his sick friends to unite themselves in spirit with our Divine Lord, in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. This they can do any time of the day or night. Lastly he invites them to turn to Mary—Health of the Sick, whatever their ailment may be. All this is a consoling work, for those in need of such consolation.

J.P.C.

The Theological Context of Law

Summary: The concept of natural law has a theological significance which is too often overlooked. It should be considered not only as a contribution to ethics, but within a genuine theological context.

This involves examination (a) of what is intrinsic and what extrinsic to human acts; (b) of the relations obtaining between the natural law, the Old Law, the New Law, and grace.

Such an examination discloses (a) the formal identification of the New Law and grace; (b) the hierarchical continuation and sublimation of nature in grace, the two orders remaining, of course, distinct, and the elevation wholly gratuitous.

An appreciation of the theological context of natural law gives, therefore, a clearer knowledge of the manner in which the concept of the law itself is formulated—and a fruitful introduction to the study of the New Law and of grace.

The doctrine of natural law and the nature of its primary precepts as developed in the "Summa Theologia" is widely discussed as a philosophical and legal question. Consideration of the doctrine at these levels is legitimate and has been very fruitful, so much so that in modern legal-philosophical thought St. Thomas Aquinas enjoys very great authority.

The theological significance of the Thomistic concept of law, however, tends to be overlooked, Question 94 of the la llae, v.g., being considered too often perhaps, as a largely sub-theological treatise included in the "Summa" for the sake of completion, but more satisfactorily assigned to a modern course in Ethics. It is true that from the theological point of view, the exalted treatment of grace which concludes the la llae provides the climax of the work, and is justly, therefore, the point of greatest concentration in the study of this part of the "Summa".

On the other hand, the treatise on law is not only an *integral* part part of "Summa Theologiae" ("semper formalissime loquitur Divus Thomas") but is a formal prelude to the consideration of grace, a prelude in which several of the dominant motifs of the principal work are already apparent. Again, it is only when natural law is seen in the light of considerations of the Old and New Law, and of grace, that the full significance of that law can be appreciated. Furthermore, the unity of the whole complex of Questions 90 to 114 is at the root of the great simplicity and complexity of St. Thomas' treatment of the order of primary precepts of natural law,[1] one of the most significant and difficult articles in the whole of the "Summa Theologiae".

---

[1]"Es ist ein Meisterwerk, wie der Aquinate in einem der inhaltsvollsten, aber auch schwierigsten Artikel seiner theologischen Summa (S. Th. I II, qu. 94 a 2) das Naturrecht zugleich in logische, metaphysische und psychologische Beleuchtung gerückt hat". M. Grabmann, "Mittelalterliches Geistesleben,

It will be recalled that the la llae treats of the more general principles of the movement of the rational creature towards God. St. Thomas is concerned, therefore, first with the nature of beatitude as end—as "finis",[2] and then with the means towards the attainment of that end, i.e., with human acts.[3] The principles of these acts are, however, either intrinsic or extrinsic to them, and among those which are intrinsic, law[4] and grace[5] are considered. Question 94, therefore, the formal consideration of natural law, appears within that part of the "Summa" which is concerned with the *external* principles of human acts. It should be noted, however, and it will be necessary to insist on the point, that it is the peculiar genius of St. Thomas to have asserted the intrinsic character of natural law.[6]

The question as to what is extrinsic and what intrinsic in these principles, is resolved in an analysis of the Prologue to the whole consideration of law and grace, which appears over Article 1 of Question 90.[7]

St. Thomas considers two exterior principles of human acts, *but these are not law and grace,* as may sometimes appear from a summary schematic outline of the la llae. They are the devil and God. The devil, extreme principle of influence of evil, has already been considered in the la pars.[8] It remains to consider God, as a transcendant principle, extrinsic to human acts, but influencing their movement towards good. God is therefore considered as the extrinsic principle of acts, first by *instructing by law.* Thus the tract on law is a consideration of God *as instructing.* Secondly, in ascending order of dignity, God is con-

---

Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik", Hueber, München, 1926, p. 101.

[2]Questions 1-5. [3]Questions 6-114. [4]Questions 90-108. [5]Questions 109-114.

[6]"Il (St. Thomas) lui préfère donc celle (definition) de Cicéron, qui en accentue le caractère intrinséciste; mais par-dessus tout il affectionne celle du juriste Ulpianus". "Il faut le redire, le mérite de Saint Thomas . . . son vrai mérite, qui assure le pérennité à sa doctrine, est d'avoir mis en sa pleine lumière le caractère intrinséciste du droit naturel. La loi naturelle n'est autre que la nature humaine, s'exprimant rationellement. C'est le dynamisme artistotélicien appliqué à l'ordre morale: l'homme se perfectionne en réalisant dans sa conduite sa condition d'homme, mais au préalable en l'exprimant par les dictées de sa raison naturelle". O. Lottin, "Le Droit Naturel chez Saint Thomas d'Aquin et ses predecesseurs", Deuxieme edition, Bruges (Belgique), p. 62 and p. 103.

[7]"Consequenter considerandum est de principibus exterioribus actuum. Principium autem exterius ad malum inclinans est diabolus, de cuius tentatione in Primo dictum est. Principium autem exterius movens ad bonum est Deus, qui et nos instruit per legem, et iuvat per gratiam. Unde primo de lege; secundo de gratia dicendum est". la llae Q. 90 Prol.

[8]Q. 114.

sidered as an extrinsic principle *assisting and fortifying by grace.* Thus the tract on grace is a consideration of God *as aiding.*

The various aspects or "rationes" of law are then clarified, distinguished, and analysed. The eternal law is conceived as God manifesting and sustaining order (ordinans et gubernans)—the natural law as God participating[9] the eternal law into human nature, *intrinsically* inclining that nature towards proper and proportionate natural ends by principles of operation within that nature. These intrinsic principles of operation comprise the natural law.[10]

In treating of the Old Law, God is considered as *extrinsically* instructing, correcting, and as reaffirming the precepts of natural law, obscured by abuse and in the deterioration of the weakened condition of man in the state of fallen nature. The New Law is presented as God, himself extrinsic to nature, instructing, elevating, and *intrinsically* ordaining towards ends which are no longer natural, but which transcend nature, i.e., towards supernatural beatitude. This end, since supernatural, is neither proper to, nor due to human nature—nor is that nature of itself proportioned to the new end.[11] Materially, the New Law is extrinsic to human nature insofar as it is a series of originally spoken counsels and precepts, and the written exposition of the life of Christ. But, formally and principally, it is a new law in the sense of a new intrinsic principle of operation,[12] transforming and elevating the nature into which it is received, and actively orienting that nature towards a new end—supernatural beatitude.

The Gospel is, therefore, a "New Law" in a double sense. In relation to the Old Testament it is "new" as a further manifestation of the Divine will—and in this sense the Old and the New can be con-

---

[9]"Participating" is used here in an active sense as sharing into, or endowing. ". . . Deus operatur in rebus naturalibus dupliciter: primo instituens ipsas naturas; secundo providens unicuique rei id quod competit suae naturae". De Verit. Q. 27 art. 6 ad 3m. Ed. Spiazzi, p. 426.

[10]But are of themselves insufficient for the attainment of those ends. This is explicitly stated by St. Thomas: "Unde oportet quod superaddantur homini divinitus aliquo principia, per quae ita ordinetur ad beatitudinem supernaturalem, sicut per principia naturalia ordinatur ad finem connaturalem, *non tamen absque adiutorio divino*". Ia IIae Q. 62 Art. 1 corp. Thus, in the Latin division given later, the general concursus of God as first mover, and the precisions to be made concerning lapsed human nature in regard to natural ends, are presupposed.

[11]cf. Ia IIae Q. 62 Art. 1 ad 3m.

[12]It is intrinsic in a sense analogous to the law of gravity in matter. "Dicendum quod dupliciter est aliquid inditum homini. Uno modo pertinens ad naturam humanam; et siv lex naturalis est lex indita homini quasi naturae superadditum per gratiae donum. Et hoc modo lex nova est indita homini, non solum indicans quid sit faciendum, sed etiam adjuvans ad implendum". Ia IIae Q. 106 Art. 1 ad 2m.

sidered as complementary expressions of Divine *positive* law insofar as the latter presents a new and additional series of precepts and counsels. Thus they are supplementary rather in the positive legal or preceptive order, directing but not transforming. This relation of the old to the new is secondary.[13] A second relation is that of the New Law to the natural law. Here there is no longer question of the compulsory expression of positive law—but of another and different series of *intrinsic principles of operation*. In this, the primary sense, the old law (natural law) and the New Law are complementary[14] in the intrinsic dynamic order, the latter enlightening by transforming.

Thus the material and extrinsic complementary factors are the Old Testament and the New Testament, as written documents. The intrinsic and formal complementary factors are the *old law* (i.e., the principles of operation towards natural ends—the laws governing the "old" man, or natural law, especially as operative in fallen nature)—and the *New Law* (i.e., the principles of operation which govern the man who has "put on Christ."—Grace).[15] Both are intrinsic, both provide an inner "pondus", a gravitation towards their respective ends, but one reaches deep into the principles of the other, elevates them, and provides for them a new and transcendent motive both in the order of formal and final causality.

The general conception is outlined in the following schema in the

---

[13]"....ad legem Evangelii duo pertinent. Unum quidem *principaliter*: scilicet ipsa gratia Spiritus Sancti interius data. Et quantum ad hoc nova lex justificat ....Aliud pertinet ad legem Evangelii *secundario*: scilicet documenta fidei, et praecepta ordinantia affectum humanum et humanos actus. Et quantum ad hoc lex nova non justificat". Ia llae Q. 106 Art. 2 corp. It should be noted that St. Thomas uses the term *"secundario"* and not the term *"accidentaliter"*.

[14]The term "complementary" is inadequate in so far as it suggests the making up of a deficiency. Absolutely considered, and in its integral state, there is no question of a deficiency of nature in regard to proportionate natural ends. There is question only of obediential potency to operations and ends of a supernatural order, which being in no way *due* to nature cannot respond to a positive *deficiency* in nature. The term "supplementary" is also inadequate in so far as it is suggestive of mere addition. Grace does not perfect nature by simple arithmetical progression, but by transformation, which if imaged in mathematical terms at all, is best considered in terms of geometrical progression.

[15]"If then any be in Christ a new creature, the old things are passed away. Behold all things are made new" 2 Cor. 5. 17 cf., also Rom. 8 28-29. The references to St. Paul in this context could be multiplied—in fact, the total doctrine of the relation of grace and nature as conceived in these questions is profoundly Pauline.

greater clarity and economy of the Latin forms:—

- *Diabolus* — inclinans ad malum (I pars Q. 114).
- *Deus* Inclinans ad bonum I. II. 90-114
  - *Ordinans*: Gubernando et providendo per legem aeternam.
  - *Instruens*:
    - *Intrinsece inclinando* naturam ad fines convenientes naturales *per principia indita* naturalia, i.e. per legem naturalem
    - *Extrinsece loquendo, corrigendo,* reaffirmando, nondum salvando—per legem veterem
    - *Extrinsece loquendo,* disponendo, indicando quid faciendum—SED ETIAM et
  - *Adjuvans*:
    - *principaliter intrinsece* elevando et adjuvando ad implendum *per principia indita et scripta* — ad fines supernaturales — per Legem Novam.
    - *Intrinsece* justificando, elevando, roborando per *principia indita* supernaturalia, quoad fines supernaturales—per gratiam.

From this division[16] St. Thomas' intention to indicate and analyse the hierarchical continuation and sublimation of nature in grace, is apparent—as is also the true *extrinsic* character of the divine and diabolical principles, and the true *intrinsic* quality of the natural law and of grace. Natural law is the intrinsic ordination, the "pondus naturae", or gravitation, towards ends in harmony with the fulness of human nature. Grace is the intrinsic elevation and ordination of that nature, a new "informing" as it were, of natural principles towards new transcendent supernatural ends unattainable by nature alone.[17]

The doctrinal context of Question 94 discloses, therefore, the mutual influence of the conceptions of natural law and of grace in St. Thomas' formulation and exposition of each of these doctrines. *Both are in the same line as intrinsic principles of operation* towards determinate ends, these ends being themselves of different orders within the same line, i.e., the line of "bonum". The end of natural law is thus the "bonum conveniens naturae", i.e., God as the author of nature and of

---

[16]This division is intended only as indicative of the general conception of St. Thomas in treating these questions. Many precisions necessary in a more formal treatment of the subject are therefore omitted.

[17]That St. Thomas wishes these two tracts, i.e., the doctrine of law and that of grace, to be taken as a continuous whole, or as distinctions within a single developing idea, is clear also from the elaborated introduction to Question 90, and the brief repetition of that introduction at the beginning of Q. 109.

the natural order. The end of grace, the "Summum bonum", God as the "bonum conveniens naturae omnino gratuite elevatae—et redemptae", the Beatific Vision.

The following conclusions should, therefore, be drawn:—

(iv) The definition of Gratian—"Lex naturalis est id quod in lege et evangelio continetur"—is not acceptable in a conception in which the New Law (Evangelium) is identified with Grace. The definition makes no adequate provision for the distinction of natural law and grace, and so is simply wider than the "definitum".[18]

(ii) There is a real sense in which the first principle of both the natural law and of grace can be expressed in identical terms—"bonum est faciendum et prosequendum", the requisite distinction being made in the subject of the proposition, i.e., "bonum naturale" or "bonum supernaturale".

(iii) The natural law and its precepts are intrinsic as principles of operation, communicated and implanted within that nature by a higher principle, itself external and transcendent. Thus they are imminent as operative principles—but not self explanatory. Their source is transcendent in Divine Wisdom.

(iv) The classical precepts (v.g., "Do nothing to others which you would not suffer done by yourself") are no longer adequate. The primary precepts and their order must now correspond to the intrinsic orientation of human nature to proportionate natural ends, at the various principal levels at which that nature is operative. Thus the theological context of Question 94 has in a sense already determined the nature and order of the primary precepts of natural law which St. Thomas teaches in Article 2 of that Question.

The unity of conception in Questions 90 to 114 of la llae reveals, therefore, the true extrinsic and true intrinsic operative factors in the subject of human acts. It indicates, too, the deep analogy by which

---

[18]The definition adopted is in fact that attributed to Ulpian and known through Justinian and Rufinus, "id quod natura omnia animalia docuit" "Viel schärfer als Gratian hat sein erster und sehr einflussreicher Kommentator Rufinus den Begiff und die Einteilungen des Jus naturale gefasst und formuliert. Er führt zuerst die Definition des römischen Rechts, der legistica traditio an: Just naturale est quod natura omnia animalia docuit". Grabmann, op. cit., p. 69. We may venture to suggest that in assigning reasons for St. Thomas preference in the "Summa" for the definition ascribed to Ulpian, Dom Lottin (op. cit) does not appear to have adverted sufficiently to the formal identification of the New Law and grace in the mind of St. Thomas.

St. Thomas proceeds in his examination of law (especially natural law) and of grace. It would be unfortunate then, if the consideration of grace were to be taken in complete isolation from the questions in law which precede it—for, it seems to us, it is in the certain *continuity* of these concepts that St. Thomas' view of the harmony and continuity of the Christian life will be revealed.

PATRICK M. FARRELL, O.P.

* * * *

HANDBOOK OF CATHOLIC ACTION, by Rev. A. J. Goodman, M.S.C. New and Revised Edition. Annals Office, Kensington, N.S.W.

Praise of Father Goodman's "Handbook of Catholic Action", falls, as it were, into the hands of the reviewer. The Handbook is over twenty years old, and now appears in an entirely renewed edition, showing all the vigour of the old publication and an added freshness imparted by the new pages. The present reviewer gave the fourth impression of the original Handbook the praise it so richly deserved, twenty years ago. The new edition, which is the sixth impression, appears with a letter of commendation from His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate, who hopes to see this little Handbook "the favourite text in Diocesan and Religious Seminaries, as well as in the Novitiates for Brothers and Sisters." A book reprinted so often has certainly proved itself, and fresh praise would seem superfluous. To use a phrase of St. Ambrose, "prolixa laudatio est, quae non quaeritur, sed tenetur."

We shall confine ourselves to noting features of the new edition.

The Papal Encyclicals are made to speak their message in the same thorough way as before; and the pronouncements laid under contribution include some of the latest discourses of the present Holy Father. As an anthology of the teachings of the Vicar of Christ on Catholic Action, Father Goodman's book is a treasure. We only regret that the dates of the respective papal pronouncements are not always indicated.

Father Goodman writes warmly, with the fervour of his zeal for an apostolate in which he has always been deeply interested. It is such a book as this— a book with a glow—that young people want. A dry manual would not serve the purpose, whatever its scientific merits might be.

Specially worthy of consideration are the pages on the spiritual and intellectual equipment of the Lay Apostle. Due prominence is given to the necessity of prayer, the utility of Gospel study, the advantages of retreats, Catholic reading, the study of the Encyclicals, etc. There is much good matter everywhere.

In fine, we can only say to this Handbook: "Go, little book, God send thee good passage."

W.L.

Dogmatic Theology

THE QUEENSHIP OF MARY

The recent encyclical *Ad coeli Reginam* is dedicated to the Queenship of Mary. There is no question of proposing a new truth of faith, since the title and the reasons for this royal prerogative have been proclaimed by Christians in every age.

Mary's royal dignity and power must be immediately related to the Kingship of Christ. Christ, even as man, is King of the entire universe by a twofold title—by natural right and by right of conquest. Christ is King by natural right because His Sacred Humanity is united in person with the Godhead. Christ is King by right of conquest because He redeemed the human race with His own precious blood. This is the starting point from which the study of Mary's Queenship begins.

THEOLOGICAL GROUNDS OF MARY'S QUEENSHIP

(a) *Queen by natural right.* The main principle on which the royal dignity of Mary rests is her Divine Maternity. "In Holy Writ, concerning the Son whom Mary will conceive, we read this sentence: 'He shall be called the Son of the most High, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of David his father, and he shall reign in the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there will be no end', and in addition Mary is called 'Mother of the Lord'; from this it is easily concluded that she is a Queen, since she bore a Son, who, at the very moment of His conception, on account of the hypostatic union of the human nature with the Word, was, also as man, a King and Lord of all things. So with complete justice St. John Damascene could write: 'When she became Mother of the Creator, she truly became Mistress of every creature.' Likewise, it can be said that the heavenly voice of the Archangel Gabriel was the first to proclaim Mary's royal office."[1]

Mary's natural claim to royal dignity comes from the fact that she bore a Son who, at the very moment of His conception, was also, as man, King and Lord of the universe. There is little resemblance in this respect between the queen-mothers of history and the royal Mother of Christ. They have borne children who later became kings. But the Son of Mary is a King from the first instant of His conception, by the very fact of the hypostatic union which took place in her womb. By

[1]The quotations from the encyclical Ad coeli Reginam are taken from the A.C.T.S. translation.

Mary's *fiat* the hand-maid of the Lord became the mistress of the created universe. At that moment of consent she gave Christ the King to the world, and was herself invested with the reflected glory of His royal dignity and power. Mary is truly a Queen because she conceived her child not only as God but also as King of the universe.

In a certain sense it is true to say that Christ owes His Kingship to Mary, since she provided for Him that human nature in which He holds royal sway over the created universe. Mary, in the words of Proclus of Constantinople, is the Loom of the Incarnation, on which was woven the royal robe of Christ's humanity. To her are applied the words of the Canticle of Canticles: "Go forth and see the King in the diadem wherewith his mother crowned him." Commenting on this text St. Ambrose writes: "Blessed is the womb of Mary, who alone has crowned the Lord. She crowned Him when she formed Him, she crowned Him when she brought Him forth."[2]

(b) *Queen by right of conquest.* The Blessed Virgin is given the title of Queen not only because of her Divine Maternity, but also because of her exceptional role of Co-Redemptrix in the work of our eternal salvation. "If Mary, in taking an active part in the spiritual salvation of souls, was, by God's design, associated with Jesus Christ, the source of salvation itself, and in a manner comparable to that in which Eve was associated with Adam, the source of death, so that it may be stated that the work of our salvation was accomplished by a kind of recapitulation, in which a virgin is instrumental in the salvation of the human race, just as a virgin had been closely associated with its death; if, moreover, it can likewise be stated that this glorious Lady had been chosen Mother of Christ 'in order that she might become a partner in the redemption of the human race'; and if, in truth, 'it was she who, free of the stain of actual and original sin, and ever most closely bound to her Son, on Golgotha offered that Son to the Eternal Father together with the complete sacrifice of her maternal rights and maternal love, like a new Eve, for all the sons of Adam, stained as they were by his lamentable fall,' then it may be legitimately concluded that as Christ, the new Adam, must be called a King, not merely because He is the Son of God, but also because He is our Redeemer, so analogously, the Most Blessed Virgin is Queen, not only because she is Mother of God, but also because, as the new Eve, she was associated with the new Adam."

---

[2]P.L. 16, 328.

This second title of Mary's Queenship can be summed up as follows: Christ is King by right of conquest because He is the Redeemer; Mary is Queen by right of conquest because she is the Co-Redemptrix.

The Eve-Mary parallel to which the Holy Father appeals, is a familiar patristic theme. Already in the writings of St. Irenaeus we find formulated the principle that Mary was a partner and a voluntary agent in the work of restoration, as Eve had been instrumental and responsible in Adam's fall. "As Eve was seduced by the word of an angel to avoid God after she had disobeyed His word, so Mary, by the word of an angel, had the glad tidings delivered to her that she might bear God, obeying His word. And whereas the former had disobeyed God, yet the latter was persuaded to obey God in order that the Virgin Mary might be the advocate of the virgin Eve. And as the human race was sentenced to death by means of a virgin, it is set aright by means of a virgin. The balance is restored to equilibrium: a virgin's disobedience is saved by a virgin's obedience. For while the sin of the first man was emended by the correction of the First-born, the guile of the serpent was overcome by the simplicity of the dove (Mary), and we were set free from those chains by which we had been bound to death."[3]

In the divine economy of the Redemption, Mary is destined to perform the function of a second Eve. She reverses the course of history, by co-operating with Christ, the second Adam, in the salvation of the human race. The knot of Eve's disobedience receives its unloosing through the obedience of Mary.[4]

On Calvary Christ alone paid the price of our redemption. He alone was the priest and victim of that sacrifice from which stems the salvation of the world. But there stood by the cross of Jesus, Mary His Mother, co-operating with Him in the act of redemption. She merited for us congruously what Christ merited for us condignly. She was chosen as Mother of Christ so that she might be associated in the work of salvation. At the moment of the Incarnation she prepared the victim of Calvary by communicating the substance of her flesh to the Only-begotten Son of God. In the name of the entire human race she placed in the hands of the Sovereign Priest the victim of sacrifice which He alone could offer to God on

[3]Adv. Haer., P.G. 7, 1175-6. English translation from P. Palmer, Mary in the Documents of the Church, p. 13.
[4]Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., P.G. 7, 959.

the cross. And then at the last hour on Golgotha, Mary offered her Son to the Eternal Father for the entire race of Adam. She rejoiced that her Son was being offered for the salvation of men, sacrificing her maternal love and her maternal rights. She identified herself with the victim on the cross by an intensity of compassion, united to Him in a community of pain and will. "Thus Mary suffered and all but died along with her Son suffering and dying; thus for the salvation of men she abdicated the rights of a mother towards her Son; and insofar as it was hers to do, she immolated the Son to placate God's justice, so that she herself may justly be said to have redeemed the human race together with Christ."[5]

It is from these considerations that Mary's royal dignity is established. Just as Christ is our Lord and our King by right of conquest, because he redeemed us by His blood, so Mary is our Lady and our Queen because she redeemed us together with Christ by giving of her substance, by offering Him on the cross.

THE NATURE OF MARY'S QUEENSHIP

Having developed the theological grounds of Mary's royal dignity, the encyclical proceeds to clarify the nature of her Queenship. "In the full and strict meaning of the term, only Jesus Christ, the God-man, is King; but Mary, too, as Mother of the divine Christ, as His associate in the Redemption, in His struggle with His enemies and His final victory over them, has a share, though in a limited and analogous way, in His royal dignity. For from her union with Christ she attains a radiant eminence transcending that of any other creature; from her union with Christ she received the royal right to dispose of the treasures of the Divine Redeemer's Kingdom; from her union with Christ finally is derived the inexhaustible efficacy of her maternal intercession before the Son and His Father."

Mary does not reign as a completely independent sovereign. Her regal status is not comparable to that of a monarch in a political system where a queen occupies the throne instead of a king. Just as Mary does not redeem the human race independently of Christ, so she does not reign independently of Christ. The Queenship of Mary is subordinated and participated, reproducing in an analogous way, the Kingship of Christ Himself. It is He who reflects on His Blessed Mother, the glory, the majesty and the dominion of His own Kingship. Through

---

[5]Benedict XV, Inter Sodalicia, A.A.S., 1918, p. 182.

Him, with Him, and in subordination to Him, Mary reigns as Queen with a kingdom as vast as that of Her Son.[6]

The encyclical repeatedly emphasises that the Queenship of Mary is centered in Christ, that all her royal pre-rogatives come from her union with her divine Son. Mary with Christ at Bethlehem and Nazareth, Mary with Christ on Calvary, Mary with Christ in royal dignity and power—these are the great themes which underlie the doctrine of Mary's Queenship.

With Mary's regal office placed in its correct perspective, we can distinguish three aspects of her Queenship—her pre-eminence over all created things; her power to dispense the treasures of Christ's kingdom: her unfailing efficacy of intercession with the Son and the Father.

a) *Pre-eminence of Mary Queen.* Mary, as Queen, is possessed of a radiant splendour which places her at the summit of God's creation. This singular dignity of Mary's Queenship is not only derived from her Divine Maternity, but it is enhanced by her plenitude of grace. In fact, if we consider the superabundance of grace which adorned the soul of the Blessed Virgin, then it is clear that Mary is also Queen by grace. From the first moment of her Immaculate Conception, she surpassed all the angels and saints in holiness and sanctity. She possessed such fulness of innocence and holiness that, under God, a greater could not be dreamed of, and only God could comprehend it.[7] Thus Mary may be called Queen of the human race by title of grace. She is the crown of God's creation, for within her soul is contained, in a pre-eminent way, all the graces and virtues conferred on men. And so we find that Mary is hailed by tradition as the very model of all purity and innocence; she is described as more beautiful than beauty, more gracious than grace, more holy than holiness. Because of this plenitude of grace, Mary exercises a spiritual queenship and a spiritual dominion over the hearts of men. She becomes an ideal of spiritual perfection which inspires every Christian soul.

Considered in itself, this plenitude of grace confers on Mary a metaphorical queenship. But taken in conjunction with her strict royal titles of Divine Mother and Co-Redemptrix, it helps us to appreciate the queenly dignity of Mary, who, after her Son, possesses primacy over all creation.

b) *Mary-Queen as dispenser of grace and maternal suppliant.* Having been associated with Christ, as Mother and Co-Operatrix, in the

[6]Pius XII, A.A.S., 1946, pp. 264-267.
[7]Pius IX, Ineffabilis Deus, cited in encyclical Ad coeli Reginam.

redemption of the human race, Mary remains eternally associated with Him in the dispensation of the graces which flow from the redemption. From Christ Mary receives the power to distribute the treasures of His Kingdom. From Him she receives a share in that influence by which He reigns over the hearts of men. But Mary is not only the dispenser of divine favours, she also *determines* the distribution of grace by her maternal intercession. As Queen, enthroned by the side of Christ, she intercedes for the human race with a mother's prayers—prayers that have an inexhaustible efficacy. "With a heart that is truly a mother's, does she approach the problem of our salvation, and is solicitous for the whole human race; made Queen of heaven and earth by the Lord, exalted above all choirs of angels and saints, and standing at the right hand of her Only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, she intercedes powerfully for us with a mother's prayers, obtains what she seeks, and cannot be refused".[8]

This, as the Holy Father reminds us, is the glory of all Christians —they are subjects of the Virgin Mother of God, who, while wielding royal power, burns with a mother's love.

C. TIERNEY.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

GOD OUR FATHER: A Devotional Study of Our Adoption as Sons in Christ Jesus. By Hugh Kelly, S.J. Dublin. M. H. Gill and Son Ltd. (6/-).

This work treats briefly the doctrine of our adoption as sons of God. Much has been heard lately of the expression, "The Brotherhood of Man." However, when seen in relationship to the Fatherhood of God this takes on a really meaningful nature. It is in this setting that Fr. Kelly develops his subject. The whole life of Grace: how man lost it, and what Divine Goodness has done to restore man to that State—these are treated each in turn. How God has chosen to bring man back to that state through the Incarnation and Redemption forms a good half of the book: the role of the three Divine Persons of the Blessed Trinity, and Mary's part in the Divine Plan are clearly shown. Man's wonderful destiny—to be actually raised to the sonship of God; to reign with Christ our elder brother as "co-heirs" with Him, for all eternity: what this implies and the remarkable way it is achieved. All this Fr. Kelly so simply and yet so logically expounds for us. Worthy of note is the full and apt use of the Scriptures. Finally, the division of the chapters into sections, each a distinct meditation in itself, is very helpful to the reader to grasp this difficult matter.

J.P.C.

---

[8]Ibid.

Moral Theology

CONFESSOR'S ADVICE AND THE USE OF THE *SAFE PERIOD.*

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. Would a confessor be justified in suggesting on his own initiative the use of the "Safe Period" to a couple, who, for entirely selfish motives, or at least for reasons which could not be classed as sufficiently serious from an economic, medical, eugenic or social viewpoint, were practising birth prevention? The motive for the suggestion would be to eliminate these mortal sins from their lives, or at least to decrease their number.

2. What if the couple themselves made the approach and enquired about the "Safe Period", the above conditions of selfishness and insufficiency of reason being present? In other words, is avoidance of evil a sufficient ground for suggesting the "Safe Period"?

ZELOSUS.

REPLY.

A study of the physical laws which govern the conception of the human species, based on careful observation over a considerable period of years and verified by experience, has made it possible to predict with reasonable accuracy the days during the course of the female cycle when conception is highly improbable. This development is the outcome of scientific work of our own day; but for a much longer time the existence of periods of infertility was more than suspected. That some connection could be traced between the phenomenon of menstruation and the conditions favourable to conception was commonly accepted, though the conclusions arrived at were inaccurate, if not altogether erroneous. Granted that periods of infertility occur, the moral problem of the use of marriage during these periods, or of restricting its use to the times they are thought to come about, is the same whatever be the actual days of infertility. It is not surprising then to find that as long ago as 1853 the Sacred Penitentiary was requested to answer the following question:

Certain married members of the faithful, relying on the opinion of experienced medical men, are persuaded that there are several days in each month when conception, on the part of the woman cannot eventuate. Should these people be disturbed if they use their marriage only on these days, especially if they have lawful reasons for abstaining from the conjugal act?

The answer was: The persons referred to in the question are not to be disturbed, provided they do nothing which would prevent conception.[1]

Another answer of the S. Penitentiary was given on 16th June, 1880 to a question on the same subject:

Married persons using their marriage in such a way are not to be made uneasy in conscience, and the confessor may give the advice in question, and tactfully suggest it to those whom he has endeavoured without success to deter from the detestable crime of onanism.[2]

From these decisions we may conclude:

(a) The restriction of the use of marriage to the seasons when conception cannot follow is not an evil in itself. Otherwise it could never be lawful; and the persons referred to in the first question are in circumstances where they may be allowed to continue without an effort being made to correct them. What these circumstances are we do not know completely, but in some cases at least, there was reason for abstaining from the use of marriage, and so from being the parents of future children.

(b) If married persons restricting the use of their rights to times when conception is less likely need not be disturbed, it follows that the practice, considered in itself, cannot be a serious obstacle to their salvation, and so not a mortal sin.

(c) The confessor may prudently suggest periodic continence as a last remedy to overcome the vice of onanism, not necessarily as something desirable absolutely, but, at any rate, as the lesser of two evils.

With these remarks we may seem to have answered the questions of our correspondent, but the matter is so important that we may be pardoned for devoting further attention to it.

Much has been written in recent years on the question of the use of marriage during the days of infertility, and two Popes, the present Holy Father[3] and his predecessor, Pius XI,[4] have given a lead to moralists in arriving at conclusions concerning its lawfulness. These conclusions may be set down as follows:—

(1) The use of marriage during the seasons when conception is unlikely is not forbidden by the law of nature. The marriage contract gives the right to husband and wife to perform those acts which are

---

[1]Quoted by Lanza-Palazzini. *De Castitate et Luxuria.* Turin-Rome, 1953, p. 85.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Discourse to the Italian Association of Catholic Midwives, 29th Oct., 1951. The address was delivered in Italian. The quotations given are taken from the English Translation published for the Pontifical Court Club by the Salesian Press (London). The original appeared in the A.A.S. 43 (1951) 844-846.

[4]Encyclical Letter *Casti Connubii.* A.A.S. 22 (1930) 539 seq.

ordained to the begetting of children, without any limitation of time. They transfer to each other a pereptual right, one which will never lapse till the moment of death, which they may avail of and must make available at all times, within the bounds of what can be considered humanly reasonable. This doctrine was admirably expressed by the late Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical Letter *Casti Connubii.*

> . . . We must not say that married persons act contrary to the order of nature when they use their right in a correct and natural manner, although on account of natural causes, whether of time or of some defects, a new life cannot ensue. There are, indeed, in matrimony itself and in the use of conjugal rights, certain secondary ends, as are mutual help, the fostering of mutual love and the satisfaction of concupiscence, which married persons are not forbidden to seek after, provided the intrisnic nature of the natural act remains unimpaired and thus retains its proper ordering to its primary purpose.[5]

The Encyclical was published about the time when the theories of Ogino and Knaus were becoming known and disseminated. It was also during the great economic depression, when a real fear of starvation faced so many. It is not to be wondered at, if the words of the Holy Father were referred to by not a few as a justification for restricting the use of marriage to the days of infertility. No doubt many a husband and wife, then and since, has had reason to doubt the prudence of accepting the responsibility of children; and for them the restriction of the use of marriage may have proved their eternal as well as temporal salvation. The Pope, however, did not write of the restriction of marriage relations to those days when the origin of life was impossible, much less did he declare that such a practice was always free from blame. To quote Pope Pius XI as an authority for the general practice of what is described as "using the Safe Period" is unwarranted.

(2) Any restriction of the use of marriage rights would be unlawful without the consent of both parties, for "the right deriving from the marriage contract is a permanent right, uninterrupted and continuous, of each of partners in respect of the other."[6] For one partner to refuse to render the marriage debt against the will of the other is to violate the matrimonial contract, and commit a sin of injustice. Further, if a condition were incorporated into the contract of marriage that the right of intercourse were to be limited to certain days and certain circumstances, the marriage itself would be invalid, because of lack of proper matrimonial consent.

(3) Abstention from the use of marriage, even with mutual consent,

---

[5] *Casti Connubii.* A.A.S. an. cit. p. 561.
[6] A.A.S. 43 (1951) 845.

except on the days of infertility, implies a refusal to undertake the responsibilities which are inherent in the married life. The primary purpose of marriage is the continuation of the human race. The divine command to our first parents, when the Creator instituted the state of marriage was: *Increase and multiply.* A person who voluntarily accepts a state of life, is expected not only to fulfil the negative duty of refraining from all that is incompatible with it, but also to perform what is required of him by way of positive contribution to achieving the purpose of the state of life he has undertaken. To use an imperfect example, a soldier who does not run away in the face of the enemy cannot be shot as a deserter, but his country demands that he do his best to fight and not merely to stay where he is. Likewise, the human race and the Creator look to married couples as the originators of the next generation; and to refuse unreasonably to make a positive endeavour to furnish the benefit to the race which is the reason for the state of marriage "would be to sin against the very meaning of the married life." "Marriage binds to a state of life which, while conferring certain rights, at the same time imposes the accomplishment of a positive work which belongs to the very state of wedlock."[7]

(4) Good reasons may exist which will excuse the married couple from positive contribution to the human race; and where those reasons are verified, the husband and wife may lawfully seek the secondary ends of marriage: mutual help, the fostering of mutual love and the satisfaction of concupiscence, provided they do nothing which destroys the naural tendency of their acts. "The general principle can be stated that the fulfilment of a positive duty may be withheld should grave reasons, independent of the good will of those obliged to it, show that such fulfilment is untimely, or make it evident that it cannot be demanded equitably by that which requires the fulfilment—in this case the human race."[8] "Serious reasons often put forward on medical, eugenic, economic and social grounds can exempt from that obligatory service, even for a considerable period of time, even for the entire duration of the marriage."[9]

Medical reasons could easily make it inadvisable and perhaps dangerous to the life or health of the wife to bear children. If expert medical opinion considers she would run the risk of life or serious disability from pregnancy, she could be justified in refusing the *debitum.*

7Ibid.
8Ibid.
9Ibid. p. 846.

except during the season of sterility. While the marriage contract imposes an obligation towards her husband in the matter of conjugal relations, this obligation does not urge with the risk of serious danger to herself.

Eugenic reasons would come into force as a justification of restricting the use of marriage to the days of infertility, if there were grounds to fear that the children would be born defective and become an undue burden on their parents.

Social reasons may weigh also in the case of parents from whom defective children are likely. Considering the child, it would be better for it to be born defectively than not at all, but the thought of giving to society a child who would prove an incumbrance may well make it reasonable for such couples to desire not to have children.

Economic reasons frequently come into play. The education of children, even with the help of social benefits and child endowment, is an expensive matter. The education of children is part of the primary purpose of marriage (*procreatio et educatio prolis*), and it may be prudent for the husband and wife so to limit their family that the task of rearing them will not be beyond their financial resources.

While it is possible for those intimately concerned to exaggerate their difficulties, there can be no denying that they are at times objectively true. Trust in God's Providence is an exercise of the virtue of hope, but heroic virtue is not demanded as a condition of salvation. The confessor, who learns of the temptation to practise birth prevention by interference with the marriage act, and knows what circumstances are making this temptation a dangerous one, could well suggest the adoption of periodic continence as a means to avoid a grave inconvenience, and leave available to the couple a restricted enjoyment of the secondary benefits of marriage.

(5) The natural and inevitable inconveniences of bearing children and rearing them are not, of course, reasons for evading the responsibility of parenthood. Neither are what are called worldly motives: a desire for unnecessary social or business activities which are incompatible with the duties of parents towards their children, both before and after birth; the inordinate ambition to rise in the social scale or enjoy pleasures altogether beyond what as accepted as reasonable in a certain condition of life; the amassing of wealth for its own sake, and so on. "If, in the light of a reasonable and fair judgment, there are no serious personal reasons, or reasons deriving from external circumstances, then the habitual intention to avoid the fruitfulness of the union, while at

the same time continuing fully to satisfy the sensual intent, can only arise from a false appreciation of life and from motives that run counter to true standards of moral conduct."[10]

(6) It cannot be established that the sin involved in restricting the use of marriage to the seasons of sterility is a serious one, if the matter be viewed theoretically. It is somewhat equivalent to using marriage for the purposes of self gratification, which is the immoderate enjoyment of what is otherwise lawful, and does not seem to be a grave departure from the moral order, provided the human act of intercourse is not deprived of its essential tendencies. Practically, the use of the "Safe period" can be dangerous. It requires continence for several days, and so demands a sacrifice which the parties may feel difficult to make, thus paving the way for more serious offences, if they are determined not to have children.

If asked by penitents on the lawfulness of restricted use of the marriage rights, the confessor should first satisfy himself that there is sufficient reason to excuse from the duty of parenthood. If such a reason is present, he may inform them that there is no sin in using their marriage during the time when conception is unlikely. If there be no good reason why they should not contribute to the good of the race by bringing children into the world, he should endeavour to dissuade them from adopting what is known as use of the "Safe Period"; but should they persist in their intention, he can scarcely deny them absolution for that reason alone, as it cannot be shown that they are bent on neglecting something which is imposed on a particular couple under pain of grave sin. If the penitent be an habitual onanist, and the use of marriage only during the days of sterility will cure him from his vice, the confessor may suggest it to him. He cannot be judged unworthy of absolution merely because he refuses to undertake the duties of parenthood; and if he is determined on this point, it is preferable that he should be preserved from mortal sin in the pursuit of his deplorable purpose rather than offend God seriously by using means that are a grave violation of the natural law.

* * * *

ABSOLUTION FROM CENSURE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In the July number of the RECORD, you treated a case of absolution from the excommunication contracted for the sin of delib-

[10]Ibid.

erately bringing about a miscarriage (pp. 229 et. seq.). The confessor gave absolution thinking the reservation did not apply in the case. Would you be good enough to outline what the confessor would have done, had he been fresh from the schools, with the Censure Tract still clear in his mind.

CONFESSARIUS.

REPLY.

The confessor in the question referred to had not the faculty to absolve from reserved cases, and the excommunication incurred is reserved by the Code to the Ordinary (can. 2350, par. 1). We presume there was no excusing cause and the censure was incurred. The first course open to him was to tell the penitent he had no authority to absolve from the censure and to direct her to another confessor who had the necessary faculty. If this were impossible, he could decide whether the conditions were verified which would make it an *urgent case* as laid down in can. 2254. Having prudently satisfied himself that it was a case of urgency, he could absolve from both censure and sin immediately, placing on the penitent the obligation to have recourse within a month to the S. Penitentiary or the Bishop or some priest who enjoyed the faculty to absolve from the excommunication under which she lay, and to obey whatever directions might be given. All of which is not nearly as complicated as it may seem at first sight.

The absence of a confessor with power to absolve from the excommunication need not be taken as strictly physical absence; it is sufficient that he cannot be approached without grave inconvenience. It may well be a grave inconvenience to leave one confessional and seek the privileged confessor in another part of the same church, especially if there are other members of the faithful present who could draw conclusions detrimental to the good name of the penitent. They could easily suspect that she was refused absolution by one confessor and was about to seek it from another.

The case is urgent in the sense of what is stated in can. 2254 in two hypotheses: (a) if the censure cannot be observed in the external forum without danger of grave scandal or loss of reputation, or (b) if it is difficult for the penitent to remain in the state of mortal sin for the time necessary to request and obtain directions from the competent superior as to what he wishes to be done.

One of the effects of excommunication is that it deprives the person who incurs it of the right to receive the Sacraments (can. 2260). To remain away from Communion when her friends and family know

she has been to Confession, does give rise to danger of loss of reputation, and so this would seem, in many instances, to make the need for absolution an urgent one. Further, a penitent coming to confession with contrition and a hope of reconciliation with God would usually suffer a great disappointment to be told some time must elapse before absolution can be given. A delay of twenty-four hours is considered a serious one, as indeed it is a serious matter to be left in the state of mortal sin for so long.

Having decided that he may give absolution himself, because the case is urgent for one or both the reasons mentioned above, the confessor informs the penitent that she will be absolved immediately, but that there is an obligation on her—the penitent in this case is a woman—under pain of a like excommunication, to refer to matter within a month to the Bishop or the Vicar General or some priest who is authorised to absolve from this penalty. A practical course would seem to be to tell her the name of some priest in the neighbourhood who has the necessary faculties and suggest that she may fulfil this obligation by going to confession within a month to the priest named, to whom she will confess again the crime of procuring the miscarriage, adding that she had already received absolution, but has been instructed by her former confessor to refer the matter to one who had authority to finalise the affair for her.

If desired, recourse may be had to a Superior having the necessary faculties (in this case the Ordinary or a priest delegated by him) by letter. The penitent may do this herself, using a fictitious name, but giving some address to which the answer can be directed. It may be better for the confessor to write for her, without any indication as to the identity of the penitent. In due course, the penitent should return to the same confessor, who will deliver the Superior's reply containing the admonitions and instructions which he has deemed necessary. It is usually left to a confessor of the penitent's choice to execute the admonitions.

Finally, if the confessor who absolves from a reserved censure in circumstances of urgency prudently judges that all recourse to a Superior is impracticable, he will himself enjoin what is prescribed by law (*iniunctis de iure inungendis*). The things prescribed by law are: the reparation of any injury, or at least a serious promise to make such when possible; the undoing of any scandal that may have been caused, and the performance of a suitable penance. In the case of an occult crime, as the one under consideration, the imposing of a suitable penance

will be all that is required. The penance, not necessarily to be identified with the sacramental penance for the sin involved, should be a grave one according to the ordinary standards of what would involve a serious effort on the part of the particular penitent.

Frequently, the confessor will find that he has the faculty to absolve from censures reserved by the Code to the Ordinary, if not habitually, at certain seasons of the year and on stated occasions. We may repeat what was stated in the last issue, that the confessor can know what privileges he enjoys by reference to the diocesan faculty sheet. It is well to bear in mind the direction of the Ordinary usually set down in the faculty sheet: *Te autem monitum volumus ut, cum a reservatis absolvas, iniungas de iure inungenda et congruam poenitentiam imponas.*

JAMES MADDEN.

Canon Law

MARRIAGE CASE CONCERNING THE CANONICAL FORM OF MARRIAGE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Some time ago a discussion took place among a group of priests concerning the following marriage case. I wonder if you would discuss the case in the pages of the A.C.R. The details of the case are as follows: John, the son of a Catholic father and a non-Catholic mother, was baptised in the Catholic Church, but was not given any religious upbringing from his infancy. Mary, also, a child of mixed marriage, was baptised in the Catholic Church and did not receive any religious training whatsoever. Subsequently John married Mary in a registry office. The marriage was contracted before 1st January, 1949. As far as the canonical form of marriage is concerned, should this marriage be regarded as valid or invalid? The case would become a very practical one if a civil divorce was obtained and one or both of the parties wished to contract a new marriage in the Catholic Church.

CANONIST.

REPLY.

The single detail which makes all the difference in answering the above query is the circumstance of the date of the marriage between John and Mary. The importance of this detail derives from the fact that in recent years a change has been introduced into the law regarding those who are bound by the canonical form of marriage, and this is precisely the point at issue in the case submitted by our correspondent.

The change in the canonical legislation on this point became effective in regard to a certain class of marriages celebrated on and after 1st January, 1949. The marriage described by our correspondent belongs to the class of marriages concerned in the change of legislation, and since it is stated to have taken place before the new legislation was introduced, it is clear that the validity or otherwise of this marriage must be judged according to the law as it existed before the new legislation was introduced.

Insofar as our case is concerned, the law as it stood in the Code before 1st January, 1949, was contained in the second paragraph of Canon 1099, and it read as follows: "Without prejudice to the prescriptions of I,n.I, non-Catholics, whether baptised or not baptised, if they contract marriage among themselves, are nowhere bound to observe

the Catholic form of marriage; and, likewise, those born of non-Catholic parents, even though they have been baptised in the Catholic Church, who have grown up from infancy in heresy or schism or infidelity, or without any religion, as often as they contract marriage with a non-Catholic party".

At first there was considerable discussion about the precise meaning of the phrase, "born of non-Catholic parents" (*ab acatholicis nati*), and in particular it was controverted among the canonists whether this expression included those who had been born of Mixed Marriages, i.e., of marriages in which only one parent was a non-Catholic. This is precisely the case that is contemplated in our query. It is sufficient to state here that the matter was finally decided by a reply of the Pontifical Code Commission on 20th July, 1929. This response, contrary to the more commonly held opinion, affirmed that the children of mixed marriages were included in the expression *ab acatholicis nati*, and, consequently were not bound by the canonical form of marriage if the other circumstances required by this section of Canon 1099 were also verified. Moreover, in another response given on 25th July, 1931, the Pontifical Code Commission declared that the interpretation of the expression *ab acatholicis nati* given by the same Commission on 20th July, 1929 was declarative, not extensive. This meant that it was retroactive and did not need promulgation (cfr. can. 17). Consequently it followed that even marriages contracted between 19th May, 1918 (the day on which the Code began to bind) and 25th July, 1931 (the day on which the second decision was given) were to be judged according to this interpretation of Canon 1099, 2, given by the Commission on 25th July, 1931. This remained the law until 1st January, 1949.

Since the marriage between John and Mary is stated to have taken place before 1st January, 1949, its validity or otherwise must be judged according to the ruling of Canon 1099, 2, as it then was, interpreted in the light of the above decisions of the Pontifical Code Commission. Now, since our correspondent, in presenting his case, states that both parties to the marriage were *ab acatholicis nati* (in the sense explained) and did not receive any religious upbringing from their infancy, it might seem that the immediate and only conclusion is that, in view of the fact that they were married before 1st January, 1949, they were not bound by the canonical form of marriage and that their marriage in the registry office was valid. But it appears to us that the particular case submitted in the query cannot be decided so simply;

and this brings us to what we believe to be the real reason for the submission of the case.

Canon 1099, 2, before the abrogation of the second part of the second paragraph, stated that those born of non-catholic parents and brought up from infancy in heresy or schism or infidelity or without any religion were exempt from the canonical form of marriage "as often as they contract marriage with a non-catholic party" (quoties cum parte acatholica contraxerint). If either John or Mary had been a non-Catholic it could be said that in the circumstances the marriage would be considered to be valid, for it would then be a case of a person born *ab acatholicis* and brought up from infancy without any religious training being married to a non-Catholic party. But both John and Mary, although they qualify for inclusion under the heading *ab acatholicis nati*, were baptised in the Catholic Church, and hence it would seem that neither can be said to have contracted marriage with a *pars acatholica* as the canon requires. The question, therefore, is: Do these words of Canon 1099 as it existed before 1st January, 1949, "quoties cum parte acatholica contraxerint", imply that the marriage of John and Mary must be considered as invalid, since both were at least baptised in the Catholic Church?

On the one hand, there is the opinion that persons of this class would not have been bound by the canonical form of marriage if they had contracted marriage among themselves before 1st January, 1949. It is argued that the canon makes it clear that the legislator considered the members of this particular category as non-Catholics, insofar as the canonical form of marriage was concerned. If this interpretation of Canon 1099, 2, is adopted it would mean that the marriage between John and Mary should be regarded as valid, for each would have contracted marriage with one who was a *pars acatholica* as far as the canonical form of marriage was concerned.

On the other hand, there is the opinion that persons belonging to the category under discussion would have been bound by the canonical form of marriage if they had contracted marriage among themselves before 1st January, 1949. It can be argued that the very wording employed to express the ruling of this part of Canon 1099—as it then was—makes it clear that the legislator wished to exempt only those baptised Catholics who were born *ab acatholicis* and educated in heresy or schism or infidelity or without any religion, and only when they contracted marriage with a non-Catholic party. If, then, a person

belonging to this category were to marry another baptised Catholic, even if this Catholic were a member of the same category, the wording of the law, it was argued, made it appear that the legislator was not exempting them. The addition of the words, *quoties cum parte acatholica contraxerint,* appeared to be deliberately restrictive on the part of the legislator. Had he wished to exempt the members of this class when they also contracted marriage among themselves, the addition of the words *inter se* could have indicated this very clearly and simply. After all, the identical phrase *inter se* had been used by the legislator in the first section of the first paragraph of this canon and also in the first part of this paragraph, when he wished to embrace the members of the same category.

Moreover, in the first paragraph of this canon the legislator states that all who are baptised in the Catholic Church are bound by the canonical form of marriage as often as they contract marriage among themselves. This ruling certainly includes those who, although born of non-Catholic parents, were baptised in the Catholic Church and brought up as Catholics, even when they contracted marriage among themselves. And it appears to us that it can be argued that this part of the canon also included baptised Catholics, born of non-Catholic parents and brought up without any religion, if they contracted marriage among themselves; for the words of the canon would then be fulfilled: "Omnes in Catholica Ecclesia baptizati . . . sive hi . . . ab eadem postea defecerint, quoties inter se matrimonium ineunt". The exception of Canon 1099, 2, was extended to these only if they contracted marriage *cum parte acatholica*; and Canon 19 states that laws which establish exceptions to the law are to be interpreted strictly. In other words, if two members of this class were to contract marriage among themselves before 1st January, 1949, the validity of the marriage should be judged according to the ruling of Canon 1099, par. 1, sect. 1.

To say, as the other opinion does, that the legislator considered the members of this category to be non-Catholics as far as the canonical form of marriage was concerned, would appear to be begging the question, to be affirming the very thing that should be proved. The only legitimate conclusion from this line of reasoning should be that the *nati ab acatholicis* were, in effect, considered by the legislator as non-Catholics only when they contracted marriage with non-Catholics in the strict sense; and that is not the same as saying that they were also considered as non-Catholics when they contracted marriage among

themselves. In other words, to say that such a baptised Catholic was considered as a non-Catholic when he or she contracted marriage with a non-Catholic, is not the same as saying that two such baptised Catholics were to be considered as non-Catholics when they contracted marriage among themselves. This opinion concludes, therefore, that the exemption from the observance of the canonical form of marriage granted by the legislator to those *nati ab acatholicis* . . . etc., was a limited exemption and was restricted to certain circumstances expressly mentioned in the canon: and one of these conditions was that the other party to the marriage should be a non-Catholic.

If this interpretation of Canon 1099, 2, is adopted it would mean that the marriage between John and Mary, as put forward in our query, must be considered to be invalid on the ground of defective form.

However, in view of the foregoing exposition of the opinions in this matter, and although we have a preference for the second of the two opinions, it seems to us that the conclusion of the well-known American canonist, Doheny, who himself preferred the opinion that the canonical form was not obligatory in the case, is the practical conclusion. After treating of the question in a very brief manner and stating his personal preference, he concludes: "However, since the strict wording of the Canon does not state this, there is a doubt in the matter. Hence, such a case should be submitted to the S. Congregation of the Holy Office for solution". (Canonical Procedure in Matrimonial Cases, Formal Procedure, 2nd Ed., p. 1052.)

The query of our correspondent refers the marriage case in question to the period before 1st January, 1949, since there could be no doubt of the invalidity of that marriage if it had taken place on or after that date. The Motu Proprio of Pope Pius XII, which came into force on 1st January, 1949, abrogated the second part of this second paragraph of Canon 1099. The relevant words of this Papal document are as follows: "We decree and ordain of our own proper motion and with the fulness of Apostolic power that all persons baptised in the Catholic Church are bound to observe the canonical form of marriage. We, therefore, abrogate the second clause in the second paragraph of Canon 1099, and We order the expunction from Canon 1099 of the words: *item ab acatholicis nati, etsi in Ecclesia Catholica baptizati, qui ab infantili aetate in haeresi vel schismate aut infidelitate aut sine ulla religione adoleverunt, quoties cum parte acatholica contraxerint.*

The effect of this ruling, therefore, is that all who are baptised in the Catholic Church, even if born of non-Catholic parents and

brought up in heresy, or schism, or infidelity, or without any religion, are now bound to observe the canonical form of marriage; and if they do not observe it the marriage must be considered to be invalid on the ground of defect of canonical form. The obligation to observe the Catholic form of marriage follows from baptism in the Catholic Church. Consequently, if such a marriage as that between John and Mary were to take place on or after 1st January, 1949, it must be said to be invalid, because both were baptised in the Catholic Church and by that fact were bound to observe the canonical form of marriage.

DOMICILE AND MARRIAGE.

It may be helpful to give an additional, if brief, explanation of a particular aspect of the marriage case discussed in the previous issue of the A.C.R., especially since this aspect of the case, to some extent at least, had to be taken for granted.

The point in question is concerned with one of the two methods of acquiring a domicile, namely, by actual residence in a place with the intention of remaining there permanently, unless something unforeseen occurs to cause one's departure. According to this method of acquisition of a domicile, a formal element and a material element are required. The formal element is the proper intention, and the material element is the actual and personal residence. As soon as these two elements are simultaneously verified the domicile is immediately acquired, and it is not necessary in this method of acquisition that the person concerned should first remain in the place for a fixed and extended period of time.

The point to be elaborated—which played an important part in the marriage case previously submitted—is concerned with the nature of this intention, for it is this formal element which may, and does, give rise to difficulties. It is of the utmost importance in the acquisition of a domicile that this intention of permanent residence should not be merely a conditional and suspensive intention, that is, dependent on the occurrence of a future event: it should be an absolute intention. This does not imply that the intention must be absolutely unchangeable, otherwise the domicile is not acquired. It means the intention must be absolute in the sense that it is the person's present intention to remain in the place as an ordinary resident, and only something at present unforeseen will cause him to depart. This intention is efficacious in causing the acquisition of a domicile because, since any circumstance which might bring about a change of mind and consequent departure is unforeseen, the intention of taking up residence here and now cannot

be dependent on it or conditioned by it, as we normally understand dependence and condition.

This is obviously different from the case in which a person takes up residence in a place with the intention of remaining there permanently, provided a certain condition is fulfilled; e.g., provided he obtains a certain position of employment. In this case a domicile is not acquired by virtue of this intention, since of its very nature it has a suspensive effect. As Woywod remarks: "This is not an intention pure and simple to stay in a certain place, but a conditional intention in which the will to stay becomes absolute only after the condition is verified". (A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law, Revised Ed., 1948, Vol I, p. 771.) Antecedently to the fulfilment of this condition, therefore, the intention of the person is not sufficient for the acquisition of a domicile in that place; and this remains true, notwithstanding the fact that actual residence may have begun. For both the formal and material elements must co-exist simultaneously, and in the example given the required formal element would still be lacking, even though the person concerned may not have actually adverted to this fact.

From what has now been said it can be seen that, if a girl capable of acquiring a voluntary domicile takes up residence in a certain parish with the intention of remaining there permanently after she has been married, it is possible for her to have one of two intentions: she may have the intention of remaining there permanently *even if* the marriage does not take place; or she may have the intention of living there permanently *provided* the marriage takes place. The first of these two intentions is independent of the celebration of the marriage, and hence, since it is not conditional and suspensive, it would be sufficient for the acquisition of a domicile. (We think, however, that such an intention in these circumstances of a forthcoming marriage would be, to say the least, most unusual, and it would certainly need to be proved. For such an intention implies the abandonment of a domicile already possessed; this is something to be proved, not merely assumed.) The second of the two intentions is obviously dependent on the celebration of the marriage. Thus it is conditional, and not absolute (in the sense explained), and, as such, it is not sufficient for the acquisition of a domicile. And it is to be noted that this remains true even though the girl may not here and now advert to the fact that she has a suspensive and merely provisional intention in her mind.

Finally, the principle now enunciated, namely, that the taking up of residence in a place with the intention of remaining there permanently if marriage follows, is not of itself sufficient for the establishment of a domicile, has found application in cases tried before the S.R.Rota.

It should also be clear that, *mutatis mutandis,* the principles set down here apply also in the matter of the acquisition of a quasi-domicile.

G. C. GALLEN.

Liturgy

BAPTISMAL FONT IN HOSPITAL ORATORY.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Within my parish, but some distance from the church, is a maternity hospital conducted by religious Sisters. As it is often very inconvenient to bring children to the church for Baptism, would it be permissible to erect a Babtismal Font in the hospital Chapel?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

The Code of Canon Law states that the proper place for administering solemn baptism is the baptistery of a church or public oratory (can. 773). The following canon decrees that every parish church should have its own font, and that the local Ordinary may allow or command that a font be erected in another church or public oratory within the parish for the convenience of the faithful. Moreover, when grave inconvenience or danger prevents a child being taken to the parish church or another church that has a baptismal font to be baptised, the parish priest may perform the solemn baptism in the nearest church or public oratory within the parish, even though it has no font (can. 775). Solemn baptism may be administered in a private house only in the exceptional circumstances enumerated in canon 776. The Code, then, contemplates a font only in a church or public oratory.

Coronata says that it seems certain that the local Ordinary can allow for a just cause, the erection of a baptismal font in a semi-public oratory, for example, in a maternity hospital. In disagreeing with the contrary opinion of Augustine on the question, he considers that a maternity hospital oratory may be regarded as a special case (Instit. iuris canonci. De Sacramentis, vol. i, 154).

Must this font be blessed on Holy Saturday and on the vigil of Pentecost? According to Coronata (l.c.), it is not necessary to bless the font in non-parochial churches and oratories on these days. However, this opinion does not seem to be correct, in the light of two decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. The Congregation decreed that the baptismal font must be blessed on Holy Saturday and on the vigil of Pentecost not only in parochial churches, but also in other churches (filialibus) in which a font is lawfully erected; the entire rite must be observed in these churches; and if the parish priest is unable to perform the blessing himself, he must depute another priest to do it on each

of the two days mentioned, and not postpone the blessing to another day; finally, when sufficient ministers are not available to perform the rite according to the Missal, the rite of the Memoriale Rituum must be followed (S.R.C. 4005). The following year the Congregation was asked what must the parish priest do when he is unable to find another priest to perform the rite in the second church, to which it replied, that in such an extreme case, super quo conscientia parochi onerata manet, the parish priest may bring the baptismal water from the parish church to the other church (4057, I). These replies seem to make quite clear the procedure that must be followed.

* * * *

MORE ABOUT THE SIMPLIFIED RUBRICS.

Elsewhere in this issue of the A.C.R. (p. 286) will be found a series of replies from the Sacred Congregation of Rites that have elucidated several points of the earlier Decree promulgating the simpler form of the rubrics (cfr. A.C.R. xxxii (1955), pp. 246-267). Meantime, we have also received the commentary of Fathers A. Bugnini and I. Bellocchio published in the *Ephemerides liturgicae,* lxix (1955), pp. 113-208.

SOME CORRECTIONS.

There does not appear to be any foundation for the suggestion made in the commentary on the Decree in the July number (pp. 256; 258) that the antiphons should be doubled on those Sundays of Advent and Lent that are now to be celebrated with the rite of doubles of the first class and also on the vigil of Pentecost, now raised to double rank. On these Sundays and on the vigil of Pentecost, as on other Sundays of the year raised to double rite, the antiphons are not doubled.

Another remark that calls for some comment occurs on page 265. When the formulary of the Daily Requiem Mass (cotidiana defunctorum) is used for a Low Mass, the new Decree states that one prayer is sufficient, but three prayers may be said. Must the old rubric about the uneven number of prayers still be observed? If so, the celebrant would have to add two prayers. The commentary of the *Ephemerides* suggests, as more probable, that the uneven number of prayers need not be retained and the celebrant may add one or two prayers, but the last prayer must be the *Fidelium,* as formerly. In practice, this would mean that if the celebrant wishes to add a prayer for some particular person or persons other than all the Faithful Departed, he must say

three prayers. We notice that the *Ordo* published by the *Ephemerides*. and which carries the notice: "Ordo" huius anni redactus est collatis consiliis cum competenti Auctoritate, gives the rule in this way: in Missa quotidiana cantata *una* tantum Oratio secus tres dici possunt: I pro Defuncto, II ad libitum et III *Fidelium*: deficiente vel ignorata designatione, I Deus, veniae largitor, II ad libitum et III *Fidelium*. Until such time as an authoritative decision is given, the better rule might be: when the Daily Requiem Mass is said as a Low Mass, one prayer is sufficient, otherwise three prayers must be said, of which the last must be the *Fidelium*.

REQUIEM MASSES IN CHOIR.

The new Decree forbids votive Masses and Daily Requiem Masses when celebrated as Low Masses on 2nd to 5th and on 7th to 12th January, suppressed octaves. A votive Mass is allowed on these days when it is sung, the privileged Requiem Masses are allowed, also a Nuptial Mass. A conventual Requiem Mass is forbidden on these days according to the latest Reply of the Congregation of Rites (2nd June, 1955; Dubium 1).

ANTIPHONS TO *BENEDICTUS* AND *MAGNIFICAT*.

On the days within the former octave of the Epiphany, when the week-day Office must be recited from the Psalter and the feast, the proper antiphons to the *Benedictus* and the *Magnificat* assigned to each day within the octave are still to be said (ibid. Dub. 2).

SUNDAYS WITHIN FORMER OCTAVES.

The Office of the Sundays within the former octaves of the Ascension, Corpus Christi and the Sacred Heart should be said as at present, according to the Decree. The Congregation of Rites has now been asked: what colour vestments must be worn on these days? What Preface must be said at Mass? The Reply says that on the Sunday after the Ascension the colour of the vestments will be white, and the Preface will be that of the Ascension. On the other two Sundays mentioned the vestments will be green and the Preface of the Blessed Trinity will be said (ibid. Dub. 3).

THE NINTH LESSON OF MATINS.

The doubt that existed as to whether the new Decree had abolished the practice of commemorating a week-day or feast at Matins by reading, as the ninth lesson of Matins, the historical lesson or the homily of the commemorated office has been resolved by the declaration that a commemorated office does not enjoy a ninth lesson (ibid. Dub. 5). Hence the ninth lesson in a double office will be that belonging to the

office of the day, irrespective of the commemorations that must be made at Lauds.

VESPERS.

The new rubrics reserve First Vespers to doubles of the first and second class and Sundays. They also lay down that any double feast of the Lord takes the place of the Sunday office should the feast fall on a Sunday. In the event of this happening, the double feast acquires First Vespers, even though it may not have them of its own right, e.g. the Dedication of the Basilicas of Sts. Peter and Paul, greater double, 18th November (ibid. Dub. 6).

Since the Breviary provides no antiphon to the *Magnificat* in the week-day Office of Fridays during Paschal Time, and since the Office of Sancta Maria in sabbato no longer has First Vespers, the antiphon of the Second Vespers of the preceding Sunday must be used (ibid. Dub. 8).

NUMBER OF PRAYERS.

The number of prayers said must never exceed three (ibid. Dub 4). This limit will sometimes exclude a prayer ordered by the Ordinary *simpliciter*. For instance, if the rubrics prescribe one commemoration, and two prayers are ordered by the Ordinary, only one of these may be said, thus bringing the total to three (ibid. Dub. 10).

IMPEDED VOTIVE MASSES.

On certain days, the rubrics of the Missal allow the commemoration of an impeded votive Mass to be added to the prayer of the Mass of the day under the one conclusion, e.g. a solemn votive Mass is forbidden on a double of the first class, but in this case the commemoration of the impeded Mass may be added to the prayer of the Mass. The new rubrics do not allow any commemoration on a first class Sunday or feast or on a privileged week-day or vigil, and the latest reply of the Congregation of Rites declares that this applies to the commemoration of an impeded votive Mass, the prayer of which may not be added to the prayer of the Mass of the day, unless it is prescribed (sub praecepto). The prayer would be prescribed when it is connected with the rite, as, for instance, at an Ordination or on the occasion of a Nuptial Mass, in which case even though the votive Mass pro Sponsis is forbidden, the prayer of the votive Mass may be added to the prayer of the Mass of the day under the one conclusion and this even on a double of the first class (ibid. Dub. 9).

PRAYER OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

The same Reply (Dub. 9) introduces some changes in the rules that govern the addition of the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament to

the prayer of the Mass during the Forty Hours' Prayer and when Solemn Exposition takes place immediately after Mass. The Reply states that the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament must always be said in all Masses that are celebrated on the altar of Exposition. It will be noted that the prayer is added only in Masses that are celebrated at the altar of Exposition, not in all Masses celebrated in the church as was the previous practice. The *Ordo* referred to above gives some further rules about the position of this prayer. It is said *before* the other prayers prescribed by the rubrics. However, since these rules do not become effective before January 1956, it may be better to postpone their fuller discussion to the next issue of the A.C.R.

NEW FEASTS.

The Office and Mass for the new feast Beatae Mariae Virginis Reginae have been published. The feast will be celebrated on 31st May, as a double of the second class. The feast of St. Angela Merici, formerly observed on that day, has been transferred to 1st June.

The new feast in honour of St. Joseph the Workman (S. Joseph, Sponsi B.M.V., Opificis) will be celebrated, as a double of the first class, on 1st May. The feast of Saints Philip and James is to be transferred to 11th May. The feast of the Solemnity of St. Joseph is to be united tot the feast of 19th March.

* * * *

BUILDING A CHURCH.

A book has recently been published that certainly merits a place in every presbytery and particularly in the library of every architect engaged in church designing. The book is : CHURCH BUILDING AND FURNISHING: The Church's Way. A study in Liturgical Law by Rev. J. O'Connell.[1]

Lest anyone might be tempted to dismiss the work as one devoted to rubrical "frills", let me at once assure him that such is not the case; on the contrary, he will find here a careful, balanced and practical consideration of all parts of a church and its furnishings. Furthermore, the book is not simply a compilation of rubrics and the decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, for the author has incorporated a great deal of historical information with a view to giving some appreciation of the purpose, according to the mind of the Church, of the component parts of the building and its furnishings. For this reason alone, apart from any utilitarian motive, the book merits the attention of every

[1]Burns Oates, London. 1955. pp. xx-259. 34/- (Australian).

priest. One often hears remarked that it is impossible to reason in rubrics, to a certain extent the remark may be true, but it is also more than likely that often enough the apparent lack of logic on the part of the rubrics should be explained rather by our having inherited an erroneous idea of one or other aspect of the Church's Liturgy.

A church is a sacred place. Apart from the sacramental presence of our Lord, the church is a holy place; it is God's House. The remote purpose of a church is to give glory to God and to edify and sanctify the faithful. Its immediate purpose is to provide a suitable place for the celebration of the Sacred Liturgy, and for the participation of the faithful in public and private worship of God. Because of this inherent sanctity, a church stands in a category apart from other buildings. Of this truth the Instruction of the Holy Office (30th June, 1952) reminds us when it says: "Sacred architecture, although it may adopt new styles, may not in any way be equated with profane building, but must always perform its own office, which concerns the House of God, and the House of Prayer." This is the underlying principle that must lead us to submit to the guidance of ecclesiastical tradition and legislation in the erection of a church. Owing to the existing state of affairs in this country, very many parishes are forced to accept a school-church as their place of worship. In such circumstances it is important that we do not lose our appreciation of the true nature of a church and of the essentially different purposes of design of a church as distinct from a school-church.

After discussing the nature of a church, Father O'Connell devotes the next three chapters to the parts of a church or oratory, the position and title of a church, and the general plan of a church. The Communion Rail is nowhere prescribed by the rubrics, but it has become an essential feature of our churches. The height and width of the rail and step are important considerations, as also the width of the gates. The suggestion is made (p. 13), that since the faithful receive there the Body of Christ from the altar of sacrifice, we should regard it as the prolongation of the altar, "hence the ideal is to construct the rail to resemble somewhat the altar (the same material, style, decoration, etc.)." As to side chapels, how many are desirable, where are they best situated, and why? The discussion of the site of a church introduces the topic of the orientation of a church and the details for a foundation stone. The general plan of a church must take account of the relative importance of the various elements. The altar is the focal point, hence this fact must find expression in the design. The archi-

tectural atmosphere of the edifice must stimulate the participation of the faithful in the Sacred Rites. At various times during the year, a procession forms part of the day's Liturgy, so this, too, must be borne in mind in determining the size of aisles, doorways, and the layout of the grounds and paths surrounding the church. A spacious porch is desirable, because the rite of Baptism must begin there, and, on the same score, the baptistery should be easily accessible and not far removed from the porch. The number and position of the doors may not be decided upon haphazardly, involving as it does the comfort, convenience and safety of all who use the church. On all these questions the reader will find sound practical advice.

The Code of Canon Law instructs Ordinaries to ensure that church buildings and furnishings conform to Christian tradition and the laws of sacred art (Canons 1164, 1296). These same principles have been reiterated by the Holy Office in its recent Instruction. It is important, therefore, to have a clear understanding of the terms "Christian tradition" and "Sacred Art" before we can pass judgment on the value of modern styles. Just how modern can we be in these matters? The Church does not approve as sacred art "cheap reproductions of painted plaster statues and all the industrial rubbish that has invaded so many churches", on the other hand, much modern work is not acceptable in our churches, since sacred art, amongst other things, must be universal and intelligible. Art that requires long and learned explanations is not sacred art. Modern styles of architectural design are not excluded simply because they are modern, but they must be guided by the norms laid down by the Church. For all that, the history of christian architecture and sacred art is proof of the large measure of liberty that the architect and artist enjoys. The fifth chapter (pp. 28-56) is devoted to these questions. A subsequent chapter entitled *Images*, records the more explicit legislation of the Church concerning particular images that may not be exposed for public veneration. Speaking of the Sacristy the author remarks very justly, that generally they are much too small, whereas in practice they can scarcely be too large. He gives an exhaustive list of the various details of furniture and arrangement that call for attention, e.g. the height and width of the door leading to the sanctuary should be such as will allow the passage of the processional cross and the priest accompanied by the sacred ministers. How rarely that point has been considered! One small point with which one might disagree is the suggestion that the altar wine and cruets be provided for in the working sacristy, most

might prefer, for several reasons, to have them in the priest's sacristy. The chapter on the baptistery begins by reminding us that "after the high altar, the baptistery is the most important part of a parish church —it is the second focal point." Its size and position are determined by tradition and by practical considerations. Other chapters of the first part of the book are devoted to lighting and heating, church seating, confessionals, the pulpit, the rood, lustral water containers, the ambry, the sacrarium, the Stations of the Cross, the organ and choir, and church bells.

Part II describes the form, adornment and furniture of the altar. Following some brief notes on the history of the development of the altar, Father O'Connell gives all the necessary information for the correct construction of the various types of altars. Several useful sketches are also provided. He mentions three feet by ten inches as the very minimum dimensions for an altar and this may do for a portable Mass-kit, but many may not agree that this is sufficient for an altar in a church. If a permanent side altar in a church cannot be at least five feet long and eighteen to twenty inches wide, it is hard to see how it could be described as a fitting place for Mass. It would seem, too, that fifteen inches is better than thirteen as the desirable width of the steps of an altar, in anything but a very small church. An altar stone, as the author suggests, can scarcely be smaller than ten inches square, but it might be advisable when setting the altar stone in the table of a wooden altar, for instance, to set the stone back two or three inches from the front edge of the table, rather than one inch, to ensure that the greater part of the base of the chalice will be on the stone. Side altars should not detract from the pre-eminence of the high altar, and so they should not be placed at the sides of the high altar, but recessed in side chapels. The details of the place, form, dimensions and material of the tabernacle receive complete consideration. Tabernacles are usually much too big in height; very large tabernacles are undesirable, says the author. It is impractical to ornament a tabernacle unduly since it must be fully covered by its conopaeum, which is the chief ornament. The dossal, retable and reredos are described and their usefulness indicated. Despite the common practice, a permanent throne for Exposition cannot be recommended, since an empty throne permanently over the altar is meaningless. If the altar has no canopy over it, the Exposition throne must have a canopy. The author comments with pleasure on the movement to restore to our churches the altar canopy, in one or other of its forms, which the law

of the church requires over the high altar and the altar of the Blessed Sacrament. Not only is the altar canopy prescribed, but is enhances the beauty and magnifies the dimensions of the high altar. Architects please take note! The altar frontal, reliquaries and the use of flowers all receive attention in this chapter. Under the heading: Furniture of an altar, we are informed of the traditional use and the law in the matter of the altar cross and the candlesticks and candles in the various forms in which they are used.

Part III, entitled: Church Furniture, discusses in sixteen chapters different items, such as the credence, carpets and cushions, altar cards, altar cruets, lamps, funeral furniture, etc.

The above account should give some indication of the great mine of useful information contained in this book. Let me repeat, there is no question of elaborate schemes quite beyond the limited resources on the average parish. The Church's Way is eminently practical and expresses itself in simple dignity. The building contractor's dream: *extras,* will be reduced to a minimum by a careful study of this book in conjunction with the architect before the preparation of the final plans for the building or furnishing of a church. *Tolle, lege.*

P. L. MURPHY.

Homiletics

ON MOUNT OLIVET—THE PATER.

In this contribution we propose to accompany Our Lord to the place where He taught His Apostles the *Our Father*. A little instruction on the Lord's Prayer is good at any time. There are, of course, many commentaries on it and some of the best will be found listed in Father Prat's excellent Life of Christ (Engl. Trans. Vol. 2, p. 28). We would wish to say a special word for the *Catechismus ad parochos*.

The place where we meet to hear and meditate the words of this sublime prayer is Mount Olivet, at a point on the western slope, nearer to Jerusalem than Bethany, and more directly opposite the Temple Esplanade than Gethsemani. It is St. Luke that indicates the place clearly enough. This is the beginning of his narrative:

"One day, as Jesus was praying in a certain place, as soon as he had finished, one of his disciples said to him: Lord, teach us to pray, just as John taught his disciples."

Perhaps, that day the disciples realized as never before what a wonderful act prayer is, and how the prayer of Jesus seemed to transcend their highest conception of the mode of human communication with God. Those good Israelites knew well come forms of prayer such as that sort of Credo known as the Shema[c] and the Benedictions used so frequently in the Liturgy and outside of it. They knew, moreover, that John the Baptist had taught his disciples some special formula of prayer. Hence their request, to which Jesus made answer: "When you pray, say . . . . and He taught them the *Pater*. As the text of this prayer is given in two forms, we shall place them side by side—

Matth. VI, 9b—13.	Luke XI, 2b—4.
Our Father who art in heaven,	Father, —— ——
Hallowed be thy name,	Hallowed be thy name,
Thy kingdom come,	Thy kingdom come,
Thy will be done,	———
as in heaven (so) also on earth.	———
Give us this day our daily bread,	Give us each day our daily bread,
And forgive us our debts,	And forgive us our sins, for we
as we also have forgiven our debtors,	also forgive everyone who is our debtor,
And lead us not into temptation,	And lead us not into temptation.
But deliver us from evil.	———

This arrangement allows us to see at a glance the chief differences between the Matthaean and the Lucan form of the *Pater*. In reporting the words of Our Lord Matthew is abundant, but in narrating events he is generally an abbreviator; the opposite is true of St. Luke—he narrates

events rather fully, but abbreviates the words of Our Lord to what a gentile Christian would regard as the essential. He generally amputates or prunes specifically Jewish phraseology. Hence "who art in heaven" does not appear in the address of the Pater, and perhaps even the word "Our" would have sounded somewhat Jewish to a Hellenic ear. It occurs so often in Jewish prayers, for instance, the very frequent opening: Abinu, malkēnu.

St. Matthew gives seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer (some say *six*, regarding the final words: Lead us not . . . but deliver , , , as one composite negeative-positive petition); St. Luke gives only five, omitting the third and the seventh, probably as being virtually contained in the second and the sixth. The variations in the petition for daily bread will be noted in their place.

In these pages, we can only select, according to personal preference, some explanatory remarks which stimulate thought rather than exegetically set forth the words of the *Pater*. The Lord's Prayer—not His own personal formula, for He never said *Our* Father in his communings with *His* Father—but the Prayer He taught us to say, is a Breviary of the whole Gospel spirit and a perfect programme of Christian life. If all our desires were constantly attuned to it, and if we shaped our works according to it, we should indeed "be perfect, as our heavenly Father is perfect".

We note at once that its two parts correspond to the programme of the Incarnation sung by angelic choirs on the first Christmas night: Glory to God in the highest (first three petitions) and on earth peace of soul to men who, by God's grace, really will that peace (a sufficiency of bread, forgiveness of sins, preservation from temptations that could prove too strong for us, deliverance from all evil that is really evil).

In the address, the English language puts us at a slight disadvantage. The *Pater* is first and foremost the filial prayer—the prayer of those whom baptism has made the children of God through the infusion of the Spirit that cries: Abba, Father—secondly and consequently, it is the fraternal prayer of those who love the brethren, and say "We" rather than "I". Therefore, *Pater noster* or "Father of us" (which is the literal Greek) represents the first movement of the Prayer better than "Our Father". The heart ascends in a filial movement at the word "Father"; it expands in fraternal expansion at the word "Our". The ascensional movement is intensified by the phrase, "Who art in heaven" Our citizenship, the citizenship of our adoption as sons, is in heaven. One thinks that we do not imitate sufficiently Our Lord's own prayer-

gesture of raising the eyes to heaven (without ostentation, of course). Looking towards heaven is a splendid antidote against being satisfied with the meagre happiness of this earth. It is good for us not to feel quite happy here below.

Hallowed by thy name. May God, manifested in His Name, be recognised as Holy in the religious reverence of our hearts; may He be proclaimed Holy, as the seraphim proclaimed Him thrice Holy; may He be sanctified in the observance of the second commandment of the Decalogue; may He be hallowed in the holiness of our lives, so that our conduct does not cause the Name of God our Father to be blasphemed amongst the irreligious.

Thy Kingdom come. Kingdom here means the realization of God's royal rights in the lives of men. It is a personal matter for each one, and a social programme to be realized in the family, in the everyday relations of men, and in the interior and exterior growth of the Church, which is the Kingdom of God on earth. The petition carries our minds to the development of Christian virtues in ourselves, to the sanctity of well-ordered homes, to the mission fields. It is as wide as the claims of God's royal authority to the allegiance of all the creatures He has created to know, love and serve Him; it is as deep as the most intimate movements of hearts thoroughly willing to be subject to God their Creator and Lord; it is as long as the ages of time, for it extends to the day when God will put everything under the feet of His Christ.

Thy will be done. This petition asks that we should be enabled to make the total sacrifice of that magnificent freedom of will, which God gave us, in order to conform our desires to His—a conformity that emulates the obedience of the heavenly citizens themselves. Naturally, we seek no higher explanation of this petition than that which we meditate in the first sorrowful mystery of the Rosary.

Give us this day our daily bread. St. Matthew's *Pater* supposes the daily recital of this prayer, and asks for the provision of maintenance *to-day*. It is certain that bodily food is meant, though the term bread is wide enough to include the Holy Eucharist. The petition, in keeping with Christ's warning against pre-occupation regarding to-morrow, asks for to-day's sustinence. St. Luke, without changing the meaning, enlarges it, for his text means literally: "Our daily bread keep giving to us day by day".

Everyone knows that in the Vulgate and in our Rheims version the word qualifying the "bread", namely, *epiousios*, is translated "supersubstantial" in Matthew, and "daily" in Luke. A discussion of the

word (the exact meaning of which has not been cleared up even by its discovery in a papyrus from the Fayoum) is beyond the space at our disposal. The rendering "supersubstantial" may be regarded as due to philological speculation of Origen accepted by St. Jerome. *Epiousios* means most probably "of the proximate future", to-day or to-morrow. In the renderings of the ancient versions there is sufficient consensus to assure us that the petition envisages the bread necessary and sufficient to keep us going to-day. Like the Sermon on the Mount, this fourth petition pays homage to the paternal providence of God, and excludes anxious pre-occupation with the morrow.

Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors. Debts are clearly offences, and St. Luke translates the term: "sins". This is the only petition to which a condition is annexed, and in St. Matthew's Gospel (VI, 14f.) the condition is declared quite essential. To obtain forgiveness, we must have forgivingness in our heart: "If you forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if you do not forgive men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses". The same lesson, namely, that the obtaining of mercy is conditional on mercifulness, was given again on this same slope of Mount Olivet on Tuesday of Passion Week. When Our Lord taught His disciples, beside the withered fig-tree, that the prayer of faith can move mountains, He added: "Whenever you stand praying, forgive, if you have anything against any one; so that your Father also who is in heaven, may forgive you your trespasses" (Mark XI, 26).

There is a shade of difference here also between Matthew's *Pater* and Luke's. It is shown in the translations above. In St. Matthew's formula, the petitioner is supposed to have already done the forgiving (*aphekamen*), while in Luke's wording he pleads present or habitual forgivingness as a reason why he himself should be granted forgiveness of his sins.

And lead us not into temptation. God does not tempt anyone to evil, but in a world which, as St. John says (I Jn., V. 19), lies so much in the power of the Evil One, our heavenly Father permits and uses temptation for the probation of His children. But He wants us to be conscious of our weakness, and be humbly fearful of risks that might prove too great for us—"he who loves the danger shall perish in it" (Eccli, III, 27). We know, however, that it is not just our own caution that will preserve us, but the paternal providence of God. He is the Master of events, and we are sure that, unless He disposes things for our good, we might become unfaithful at any moment, when temptation

proves very strong. There was wisdom in St. Philip Neri's saying: "In passing through the Ghetto, I might become a Jew".

But deliver us from evil. Father Prat, who holds for a six-petition *Pater,* practically ends by admitting that this is a seventh petition. It is true that moral evil is the only true evil for man. It is true also that the perfect do not fear suffering, nor trials, nor perseceution nor combat very much. Like soldiers, they prefer the dangers of battle to the indolence of peace. But Our Lord made this prayer for all His little ones, and surely we pray also to be delivered from physical evils: "a fulgure et tempestate; a peste, fame et bello; a flagello terraemotus." Besides, a social prayer like the *Pater* very suitably ends in a universal petition: Ab omni malo libera nos Domine. The Church in the Liturgy of the Mass seems to take the petition that way.

W. LEONARD.

Notes

SOLITARY SINS

The appetite which urges man to seek the satisfaction found in the exercise of the faculty of generation was implanted in our nature by the Creator for the good of the human species. Like the other appetites, it needs to be governed and brought under subjection to the dominion of reason. Its lawful satisfaction is in the marriage state, which was instituted by God for the proper propagation of the race. The marriage contract gives to husband and wife the exclusive and perpetual right over each other in all that regards the acts which are destined by nature for the procreation of children. Outside marriage these acts are unlawful; and in the married state, any perversion which would render their natural purpose impossible is likewise forbidden. The virtue which governs this appetite is called chastity. It restrains the married from inordinate seeking for the satisfaction to which they are entitled, and imposes upon them the strict and serious obligation not only to be faithful to each other, but also to refrain from abusing their intimacies or frustrating the sacred purpose of their union. The Sacrament of Matrimony provides abundant supernatural helps to enable husband and wife to be faithful to the duties of their state. By their correspondence with these graces, the divine purpose is achieved, the earth is filled with new people and future citizens of heaven are brought forth to be trained by their parents in the practice of virtue. For the unmarried, the virtue of chastity forbids all sexual gratification, and so excludes all and every activity of the faculty of generation, with which the forbidden pleasure is associated by natural concomitance. The rule for them is perfect chastity, while for the married it is conjugal chastity. Those not united in wedlock have no special Sacrament to enable them to lead a chaste life, nor should we expect one, since their status carries no special obligations. The Sacraments common to all Christians, Baptism, Confirmation and specially the Eucharist, wherein they receive the sacred Body of Christ, are sufficient for them to subdue the temptations of the flesh.

Sad experience teaches that the virtue of chastity is easily tarnished. A deviation from its precepts implies a departure from the means ordained for the preservation of the human race. Consequently, it is of serious import, admitting of no venial matter, according to the unanimous teaching of the Theologians. Every sin of impurity is

objectively a mortal sin. Hence the need for special solicitude on the part of confessors to help those of their penitents who may be guilty of sin against the angelic virtue, or, what would be more deplorable, entangled in habits of impurity.

Attention is called in this Note to solitary sins against chastity. Among the recent publications dealing with the subject we would refer to "The Problem of Onanism" by Baron Frederick von Gagern (The Mercier Press, Cork, 1955, 15/-). Tracing the development of the child from infancy through the stages of puberty and on to maturity, the author discusses the problem of self-abuse, its symptoms, prevalence, occasions and causes, and its consequences. The moral problem is faced with understanding and sympathy, and lines of treatment are indicated which merit the attention of those charged with the direction of souls. There may be a tendency to over-emphasise the lack of moral responsibility of those who seek solitary sexual gratification; but any criticism of the book does not detract from due appreciation of its value.

By a solitary sin against chastity we understand voluntary, complete use of the sexual faculty apart from intercourse. It implies the experience of full sexual gratification, and is accompanied, in the case of the male, by seminal effusion, while the female who commits it is ordinarily conscious of the secretion of the vaginal fluid. One cannot trust all the reports and statistics given on a subject such as this, but there seems evidence that the practice of solitary abuse of the procreative faculties is alarmingly widespread.[1] The confessor would be required to judge the objective and subjective malice of this sin, should he hear it in the confessional; and he would be bound to help those of his penitents who may have fallen to overcome future temptations. His most difficult and important task would be to encourage habitual sinners to free themselves from the tyranny of a truly tenacious vice.

There is no debate that solitary sexual acts, as we here understand them, are objectively serious sins. This follows from the general teaching agreed upon by Theologians that a violation of chastity admits of no light matter. Those who do these things are excluded from the

[1]After quoting figures gathered from various sources von Gagern writes (p. 66) "looking at these enormously high figures one has to accept the fact that the onanist is the rule and the abstainer the exception. Yet, in spite of these statistics, it is in my experience an exaggeration to assert that everybody, male or female, practises or has practised onanism . . . It will be of interest to ask the question: at what ages is the practice most prevalent? The evidence demonstrates clearly that the period of puberty is the most critical." (By onanism the author understands self abuse.)

kingdom of God (1 Cor. 6, 10). More than one declaration of the Holy See can be cited to support this doctrine,[2] but when the authors come to explain wherein lies the deviation from the natural law in the act of self-abuse, they approach the question from different angles.

It has been said[3] that the malice of this act lies in the frustration of the human *semen,* which, according to St. Thomas,[4] is a man in *potentia propinqua.* One may object that the frustration of the human *semen* is no great violation of the order of nature, since nature herself is prodigal of it, not merely on the occasions of natural and spontaneous emissions, but in the act of procreation, when some million spermatozoida are expelled, and all but one of them useless for generation. Again, it is admitted that intercourse between married persons is lawful, even though they know that, because of sterility, conception is physically impossible and the *semen* will certainly be without the effect for which it was naturally intended. It may also be questioned: is the *semen humanum* a man in *potentia propinqua*? Notwithstanding these objections, it seems that the opinion which ascribes the malice of self-abuse to the frustration of the *semen,* has much to be said for it. The fact that nature is prodigal does not justify the prodigality of man. Nature would appear prodigal in many things, and at times even of human life, but no one would conclude that man may take directly the life of another on his own authority, and that murder may sometimes be justified. The Author of nature has absolute dominion over man and all his faculties, and if in the ways of Providence the *semen* should perish, it does not follow that man is free to destroy what is not his, except to use for a particular purpose. In the case of the sterile, the *semen* is destroyed *per accidens.* The couple exercise the rights they receive in marriage: the failure of conception is to be ascribed to a defect of nature beyond the control of the wills of the parties. When

---

[2]The following proposition was condemned as at least scandalous and dangerous in practice by Pope Innocent XI. *Mollities iure naturae prohibita non est. Unde si Deus eam non interdixisset, saepe esset bona et aliquando obligatoria sub mortali.* (D. 1199.) More recently (2 Aug., 1929), the Holy Office replied that it was not lawful to obtain the human sperm for the purpose of diagnosing a disease, by masturbation.

[3]Ballerini-Palmieri (*Opus Theologicum Morale,* vol. II n. 1026, 7), gives as the reason for the special malice of this sin *in frustranea seminis effusione contra ordinem naturae.* This would be the opinion also of Lehmkuhl *Theologia Moralis,* vol. I. n. 1039.

[4]*De Malo* q. 15, a. 2. *Philosophus dicit in semine humano esse quoddam divinum, in quantum scilicet est homo in potentia. Et ideo inordinatio circa emissionem seminis est circa vitam hominis in potentia propinqua. Unde manifestum est quod omnis talis actus luxuriae est peccatum mortale ex suo genere.*

we say that the *semen humanum* is a man in *potentia propinqua* we understand that it is ordered towards a human life, which it proximately tends to bring into being. It is the vehicle of life, and its purpose is to produce life. To put it to any other purpose is to employ it in a manner other than was intended by God. A conclusion, which is urged as a difficulty, is that solitary sexual sins in the female must be forbidden for another reason, since the vital element in her case is not the vaginal fluid, but the ovum, which leaves its place of production independently of the human will, and is not frustrated by the solitary act. This conclusion is admitted by Ballerini (loc. cit.) who admits that solitary sexual gratification for a woman lacks the same specific malice that it has for a man. If we wish to hold that self-abuse is of the same specific evil, no matter to which sex the person belongs, it must be conceded that the frustration of the *semen* is not the fundamental reason for the sinfulness of solitary sexual activity. At most, it would be a circumstance affecting the sin in the case of the male, perhaps changing its species, but it could not be the radical reason why the sexual faculties of either man or woman must not be employed, according to the primary law of nature, except when conception is inherently possible as a consequence.

Another theory which is given by Genicot[5] would place emphasis on the deordination of seeking for another purpose the pleasure which is intended for the sake of generation. Pleasure, however, is not the primary element, as it is accessory to the act. What we precisely desire to know is: why is the act unlawful? Nor do the truly lamentable consequences which would follow if self-abuse were lawful fully satisfy the mind when we seek for a fundamental reason for its malice. The most convincing reason seems to be that by solitary sexual acts, the individual, whether male or female, endeavours to find perfection alone and unaided, when of its very nature the faculty cannot be effectively and rightly exercised except in co-operation with a partner of the opposite sex.[6]

One might well pause to ask what it is that determines a human being, endowed with reason, to act in such a manner which is admittedly unreasonable, and brings in its train a sense of shame and deception. In many instances the passionate desire for gratification has overcome the calm dictates of reason: and a habit once formed is broken only

---

[5]*Institutiones Theologiae Moralis*, vol. 1, n. 397. Cf. Ballerini-Palmiere op. cit. n. 1028 note.

[6]Vermeersch. *Theologia Moralis* Tom. VI., n. 92. Lanza-Palazzina. *De Castitate et Luxuria*. p. 168.

with difficulty. In not a few cases, the habit begins during the years of puberty: it obtains a hold while the victim is still ignorant of the full meaning of sex and the purpose of the faculties of generation. Again, we are told that the root of the practice is often found in subconscious conflicts which seek compensation and an outlet either of defiance or pity. "Sexual trouble," writes Baron von Gagern (p. 79) "is always part of a larger trouble, of a difficulty in tackling life. It is characteristic of a man who cannot deal with himself or others. Like all neurotic symptoms, onanism (self-abuse) has its roots in the subconscious." It is a symptom, "a danger signal that we should do well to heed."

With regard to self-abuse in early puberty, it has been stated that it is not wrong, but perfectly normal and right. This conclusion would seek to find support in the evidence available that "the vast majority of young people have indulged in self-abuse at one time or another, and that it is hardly to be credited that grave sin is the normal approach to life, or that it can be so damaging as often supposed (cf. p. 75). The Catholic moralist will readily admit the natural urge to experience the new means of gratification of which the adolescent becomes aware, and he will make due allowance for ignorance when judging the gravity of a particular act, but he cannot accept the position that all is well with a boy who indulges in these practices, and that if left alone he will soon emerge to a higher plane to be free of the vice and the richer for the experiences. We firmly hold that solitary sexual activity directly brought about, whether for the sake of the pleasure to which it gives rise or for any other purpose is objectively a grave sin in the young as well as in those of mature years. Nature never intended that a youth should find maturity through the medium of acts which must of necessity defeat their own essential purpose. Self-abuse does not help the boy or girl to seek the natural complement of the faculty by marriage in due course, but would rather direct his attention upon himself. "Onanism is always the same thing. It is a substitute for love—born in loneliness and causing increasing loneliness: a vicious circle. The best way of breaking out of this is to experience and learn genuine love. This love has various forms: the love of self in its true form, demanding self perfection; the love of a partner; love for a human social group; and finally, the love of God" (p. 79).

Among adults who practice self-abuse, Baron von Gagern would distinguish two broad groups, though he warns that the distinction is not clear-cut: one form can merge into the other, and one form can

develop into another. The first group are what may be termed "typical onanists", the neurotic anti-social type, whose trouble is rooted in the subconscious. The others are described as "onanists by necessity". It must be stressed that "necessity" does not mean they are under a moral compulsion to commit acts of self-abuse, but as marriage, through external circumstances, is out of the question, they find an outlet for their sexual urge by solitary acts. The first class remain as they were even after marriage; with the others, the habit of self-abuse disappears when the sexual faculty finds its lawful object in the married life.

The subjective morality of self-abuse will always be a difficult question. There is no doubt that with some it has its origin in an abnormal physical condition, which must be taken into account when judging the guilt of the penitent. When the abnormality is such that it obscures the judgment to the extent that responsibility is lost, the confessor will frequently be unable to determine. Seldom, we think, is total responsibility lacking, unless we are ready to admit a serious psychic defect in those who are victims to the vice. Judging from their behaviour in other matters, one would be slow to question their mental balance, and plead want of it in extenuation of guilt before God. Spontaneous emissions are not human acts; and if not approved of by the will cannot be sins. They are nature's way of disposing of her surplus products and will normally occur without any help from the person concerned. But a positive act which is designed to bring them about must be condemned as a violation of the moral law, having as its purpose the use of an important human faculty contrary to the plan of the Creator.

The cure will depend on the cause of the disorder. If we accept the statement that self-abuse is a symptom, we must strive to discover the disease which it manifests. With the boy or girl passing through the stages of puberty, ignorance may be the root of the trouble. Instruction is required, but any instruction on matters of sex given in the confessional must be discreet, as was directed by the Holy Office (16th May, 1943). A useful book for Catholic teachers is the late Father Eustace Boylan's *What is Chastity* (Messenger Office, Melbourne, 5/6).[7] Youths need sympathy. Their lapses are often due to inexperience. Those of them who are addicted to self-abuse

[7]Father Boylan has valuable suggestions on Sex Instruction, which he rightly insists should be given "indirectly and, as it were, *en passant*, that it to say, mixed up with other matters."

are inclined to seek solace within themselves and are without the facility of sharing their joys and sorrows with others, and so an aggressive or reprimanding attitude of the confessor would be calculated to do them more harm than good. It would make the penitent turn more into himself and thus he would find it hard to seek guidance and remission in the Sacrament of Penance. He needs to feel that the priest understands him and is ready to help him overcome what he finds difficult to resist, though in his heart he detests it. It is likely that he is depressed by the mistaken notion that he is unique in the temptations he suffers, and it may be a relief to tell him that the struggle between the spirit and the flesh has been the common lot of mankind since the fall of our first parents. The means that enabled others to come through successfully are available to him, and there is no reason why he cannot succeed likewise. He must realise that, with the help of God, he is really stronger than any temptation, and there is no need to be downcast over past failings. Fear of future relapse often brings on the temptations, for the mind becomes occupied with the thought of what it fears, rather than devoting itself to healthy engagements which will exclude the images known to be dangerous. Why waste energy worrying about what one has no intention of doing? The confessor as a spiritual father will direct his penitent's soul to God and teach him to find in God the fitting objects of his love. The love of God will drive out all fear; and next to the love of God a tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin, the Refuge of sinners, will bring him peace and the hope of perseverance. We must not be disappointed, if we have to wait a considerable time before we see the results of our care and pity for the young soul caught up by the habits of self-abuse. If we can keep him faithful to the frequent reception of the Sacraments, he must, in the end, overcome his failing; and the recollection of the working of grace in his soul will be a motive for a more holy life during the days of his adult life.

Should the priest come across a case of self-abuse in an adult, which is of long standing and refuses to "yield to the usual treatment", he would be advised to suggest aid of an experienced Catholic medical man who could discover if the root of the trouble is physical. Psychiatry may be needed; but this knowledge and its application are not within the scope of the average priest.

In conclusion, we may remark that habits of the kind of which we write often come from want of understanding during the years of childhood and adolescence. The parents must accept the responsibility.

To help them in their task, we may recommend *The Formative Years*, by Charles E. Leary S.J. (Clonmore and Reynolds Ltd., Dublin. Burns, Oates and Washbourne Ltd., London. 5/-.)

JAMES MADDEN.

* * * *

CHRIST OF THE SAILORS, by Peter Anson, Burns, Oates, London, 1954, 198 pp. 21/9 (Aust.).

The title of this book does not describe accurately its message. Perhaps "Christ and the Seafarer" might be a better title or maybe the book could be divided into two booklets, one entitled "Christ and Fishermen", and the other "The Early Church and the Sea".

Although nearly all fishermen would be sailors, in these days at any rate, all sailors are not fishermen, or, more accurately, very few sailors are fishermen. The first five chapters of the book are about fishermen, one kind of sailor, and not about sailors in general and in these chapters, we find gathered together in a most reverent and pleasing way, the texts of scripture wherein reference is made to Christ's close association with the lake fishermen. We see him travelling with them, encouraging them, teaching them, making them his personal friends and finally choosing them as his Apostles. The author convincingly points out that these sailing fishermen were ideally suited for Christ's purpose—the dangers and hardships of their lives having developed in them a specially deep conviction of the reality of God's existence and power and more than usual courage and determination.

As many people have the idea that most men who go to sea are irresponsible, the general reading of these first five chapters of "Christ of the Sailors" would do a lot to correct that false impression. Sailors themselves of all kinds, but particularly fishing sailors, would find in these chapters a new way of looking at Our Saviour, seeing Him as one who understands their seafaring life and problems, and who has a high opinion of their class.

The second section of the book showing how the Apostles, especially St. Paul, used sea transport on their missionary journeys is not as interesting as the first section, perhaps because that subject has been written about so often already, but provides details of the journeys and places on them which give us a clearer picture of the early missions.

The final chapter on the use of maritime symbols in the early church is most interesting but again it would be necessary to remember that the symbols are taken from the tools of trade of deep sea fishermen rather than those of ordinary sailors and hence the symbols are a reminder that, as the author says (p. 155): "In a very real sense, the church started as a Mission to Fishermen'.'

The appendices (especially the 2nd) are most interesting and instructive and would have great reference value.

J.B.R.

Book Reviews

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MYSTICAL BODY, by Eugene Masure. London, 1954. Burns & Oates. 158 pp. 12/6 (Eng.).

It is eleven years since Canon Masure's first book on the Mass was translated into English under the title of *The Christian Sacrifice*. Here the author returns again to the same subject, viewed in the immediate light of the encyclical *Mediator Dei*.

The attempts of theologians to penetrate the mystery of the Eucharistic Sacrifice have been intensified in recent years. At the beginning of the century Fr. Billot proposed the theory of mystical immolation which was destined to eclipse the flourishing systems of Lessius and De Lugo. But since then, sacramental theology has been enriched by a succession of treatises, each of which has thrown additional light on some aspect of the mystery. The names of Fr. De La Taille, Abbot Vonier, Dom Casel—to mention but a few—have forced their way into the manuals of theology.

Canon Masure sets out with the conviction that Fr. Billot himself did not reach the promised land, but indicated the route which succeeding theologians have followed. The sacrifice of the Mass, has, indeed, the character of a sacred sign. But it is also an *efficacious* sign of the sacrifice of the cross. It is a ritual renewal of the mystery of Calvary under the form of a sacrament. In brief, the Mass is that which it represents.

In developing his doctrine of sacrifice the author endeavours to find a *via media* between the theories of Dom Casel and Abbot Vonier. And, on his own admission, the passage is a very narrow one. From Dom Casel he borrows the truth that the mystery of the cross is present in, and beneath, the sacramental sign. From Abbot Vonier he takes the doctrine that the mystery of Calvary is present on the altar, under the sacramental species, by means of a ritual immolation. He adds, however, an important element: the separation of the eucharistic species is not the sign of a new sacrifice; but, by reason of the transsubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, it is a new sign of the same sacrifice. Thus he concludes that the Mass is the real immolation and the real oblation of Christ and of Calvary under the species of a sacramental oblation and immolation. The sacrifice of the Mass is the efficacious sacrament of our Redemption. To establish this doctrine is the main concern of Canon Masure's treatise. But to recapture the full meaning of the Mass, he returns to the moment when the mystery was first instituted, and examines the origins of the Eucharist. This forms the subject matter of the second part of the book. The work is attractively written, and well documented from liturgical sources.

C.T.

THE IRISH EXILES IN AUSTRALIA, by T. J. Kiernan. Illustrated. Burns Oates, Melbourne. 196 pp. Price 28/6.

On page 166 of this scholarly book, John Boyle O'Reilly, one of the greatest of all the Exiles, is quoted as saying: "In the bright future which is swiftly coming to Ireland, the names of those who died for her will be written in the porch of the national temple." Unfortunately, the gifted old Fenian did not live to see that "bright future" of which he so confidently spoke and which, as we know, came only with much "blood and sweat and tears". But how his spirit must rejoice to-day as it gazes down from its high place in the long "line that for Gabriel's trumpet waits" on this magnificent tribute, this monument *aere perennius*, to the memory of all his brother exiles in that "drear land of the South", and realises that it has been accomplished by the patient industry and scholarship of the very first Ambassador to Australia of that Irish Republic for which he and so many of his kith and kin from Tone and Emmet to Pearce and de Valera nobly gave their all to establish!

The story of the Exiles is the story of 1798, 1848 and 1867; of Botany Bay, Van Diemen's Land and Western Australia. And what terrifying reading it all makes when set against the frightful background of the period! This quotation, for example, picked at random from dozens of similar passages all over the book, makes it difficult to believe that O'Reilly is not describing conditions in the Belsen camps of Nazi Germany, but in typical British prisons and slave camps of considerably less than 100 years ago: "Here they were set to work on the marsh, digging deep drains, and carrying the wet peat in their arms, stacking it near the roadways for removal. For months they toiled in the drains, which were only two feet wide, and sunk ten feet in the morass. It was a labour too hard for brutes, the half-starved men, weakened by long confinement, standing in water from a foot to two feet deep, and spading the heavy peat out of the narrow cutting over their heads . . . Siberia may have sharper tortures, but none more revolting in cold, deliberate cruelty . . . "

The shocking injustice of the whole Transportation system appears clearly from the following passage, which Dr. Kiernan is careful to quote, from a letter of Governor Hunter's to the Home Secretary in March, 1796: "The manner in which the convicts are sent from Ireland is so extremely careless and irregular that it must be felt by these people as a particular hardship, and by Government as a great inconvenience. Every ship from that country has omitted to bring out any account of the conviction or term of transportation of those they bring out, nor do we ever receive any assignment of their services, because none have been made to the master of the ship. There are many in this settlement now who have repeatedly petitioned to be allowed to leave the country, or to labour and provide for themselves in it, their time, as they say, being completed: but I cannot well depend on their account, and it is certainly an act of injustice to the men if their story should be true."

Although little is added to our knowledge of the convict priests

and what he terms the "Dawn of Catholicism," much new and interesting light is thrown on such matters as the transportation of Michael Dwyer, the escape of John Mitchell and Thomas Francis Meagher and the Irish background of Peter Lalor; and in many other ways the book may be said to fill up important gaps in the well known writings of Hogan, Cleary, O'Brien and Cullen.

Rounding off the whole work is a valuable Appendix containing no less than seventy letters of absorbing interest, written, mostly to Kevin Izod O'Doherty, by one or other of the Exiles. Strangely, no mention whatever is made of O'Doherty's historic meeting with Bishop Quinn in Dublin in 1859 or of the part he subsequently played in the bishop's great immigration scheme for Queensland.

R.W.

* * * *

MATT TALBOT AND HIS TIMES, a New, Authentic Life of the Servant of God, by Mary Purcell. M. H. Gill & Son Ltd. 278 pp. Price 12/6.

His Grace, the Most Reverend Dr. McQuaid, Archbishop of Dublin, in his Foreword, sets out the aims (and the limitations) of Miss Purcell's book.

It is a first attempt to portray in due sequence the true story of Matthew Talbot—a confirmed drunkard by the age of eighteen, who, ten years later, began a life of hidden holiness, remarkable for penance and prayer.

Special interest belongs to this work, as Miss Purcell was able to make use of material hitherto unobtainable, namely, the evidence of the Ordinary and the Apostolic Process inquiring into the life of the Servant of God. However, it is not claimed to be a definitive biography.

As a work of reference it is a student's delight. It is most informative, even in minute detail. It provides, for example, lists of books read by Matt Talbot, quotes his own annotations, and gives his favourite scripture texts. It carries an exhaustive documentation in a "Notes" Section, quoting page and line of the text; but, unfortunately, no indication is given in the text itself that sources for particular statements may be found. The book is so heavily documented that maybe it was thought that the text would be too peppered if reference numbers were printed. A useful index is provided.

The work succeeds as a portrayal of facts in due sequence, but it must not be expected to give literary enjoyment. It is too detailed in matter and too uneven in style for that. It is a pity that Miss Purcell's ability to treat a subject beautifully, as proven in the section on Matt's death, could not have coloured some of the earlier pages, or that Pat Doyle's evidence could not have been corroborated. What a gem in a sombre setting is this: "I was working for a man by the name of Poole. Matt was working for him, too, for a bit. This Mr. Poole was building a skittle-alley out at Clontarf; the skittles were banished out there when the nuns came. Mr. Poole was a bit lame, but he was a well-connected man. When I went out to work with my new clothes on—

(a trousers for 1/8, a dress-coat for 10d.—oh, that was a powerful bargain! and a brown derby hat for 4d.), Mr. Poole took one look at me, and says he to me: 'Is it to a ball or to building you're going, Pat Doyle?' And I got the sack on the spot." Pat, sure, is a welcome relief from reading, for instance, that "the firm of E. & J. Burke Ltd. had offices both at 16 Bachelor's Walk and at 59 Abbey Street—in the lane running between these main street addresses, they had stores: No. 15 and Nos. 43 to 46 inclusive." Detail!

The book will have a special appeal to Irish readers. It places Matthew Talbot in the times in which he lived, even to record that in 1893, when Matt was living the hidden life, Willie Jamieson's horse "Come Away" won the Grand National on three legs and at four to one.

C.S.P.

* * * *

THE THEOLOGY OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE, by Joseph de Guibert, S.J. Translated by Paul Barrett, O.F.M. Cap. London, Sheed and Ward, 1954; pp. 382. 18/-.

Few theologians have contributed more effectively to the progress of Spiritual Theology in modern times than Father de Guibert. His great aim was to apply to this branch of theology the scientific methods that had long been accepted in the other departments of ecclesiastical learning. The Translator's Foreword says very well that his work is characterised by "theological accuracy, unrelenting logic, virile devotion and practical commonsense" (p.v.). The original work (Theologia spiritualis ascetica et mystica. Roma, 1937: edit. 4a, 1952) was published as a manual for the course of lectures in Spiritual Theology which the author delivered for many years at the Gregorian University in Rome. It is not intended as an exhaustive treatise on the subject, but will be found to cover adequately all the fundamental aspects of the spiritual life.

The first part of the book treats of the definition, method and sources of Spiritual Theology. The nature of spiritual perfection forms the subject matter of the second part. Here the author considers the relation of perfection to charity, the other virtues and the evangelical counsels; also the importance, in the pursuit of perfection, of such practices as union with God and Christ, the imitation of God and Christ, the carrying of the Cross and conformity to the Will of God. A final chapter is devoted to the desire of perfection. The inspirations and Gifts of the Holy Ghost and the discernment of spirits are examined in the third part: while the fourth part is entitled: Man's co-operation with God in the spiritual life, in which part the question of the nature and necessity of spiritual Direction is discussed. Part five examines the various aspects of mental prayer, its nature, necessity and the different methods of making mental prayer, together with the conditions that help or hinder the efficacy of such prayer. The last two sections of the work consider the degrees of the spiritual life and infused contemplation respectively.

The translation, as noted in the Foreword, omits the bibliographical Appendix that occupies some seventy pages in the original work, and, likewise, the references given in the course of the text and at the beginning of chapters have been limited to those works generally available to English readers. The translator has done his work well, although one or two lapses have occurred. Father de Guibert does not support the opinion of those who maintain that Moral Theology deals with the Commandments and virtues only in so far as they are of precept, and Ascetical-mystical Theology with counsels and perfection not of precept (p. 7). "Diversity of souls" (p. 25) should read "diversity of schools". On page 149, the school *Devotionis modernae* of the 14-15th centuries, is erroneously described as "the modern schools (sixth to eighth centuries". In reply to the question as to whether it is necessary that the spiritual director should have personal experience of the states, especially infused contemplation, enjoyed by the soul he directs, Father de Guibert replies that it is very advantageous, and he continues: "religiosus v.g. facilius diriget animam religiosam", which may scarcely be translated: "For example, a director who is a religious will ordinarily be better equipped to guide religious than will a secular priest" (p. 168). There are several typographical errors in paragraph 238.

Anyone who wishes to acquire a firm and accurate grasp of the principles of the spiritual life will find this book of great assistance.

P.L.M.

* * * *

General Index

Contents of Volume XXXII.

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.
(Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.)

Ad Caeli Reginam, Encyclical Letter 1
Blasphemy, Pope's indulgenced prayer against 1
Books and Newspapers, Condemnation of certain 287
Chaplains on ships, Faculties of 193
China, Encyclical Letter to clergy and people 97
Cinematography, Radio and Television, Papal Commission for 105
Communism, Pastoral Letter of Australian Bishops on 197
Faculty of Sacred Theology, Erection at Sydney 97
Liturgical Week at Melbourne, Letter of Secretariate of State 196
Mass, Evening, Warning about 195
Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, Papal Letter on centenary ... 104
Oraison, M., Book condemned .. 106
Papal Address on November 2nd, 1954 2
Religious Vocations, Foundation of Special Work for 283
Ritual, Faculty to use new American 201
Rosary, Indulgences for Family recital 10
Rubrics, Decree on simplification 187, 246
Rubrics, Queries on simplification of 286
St. Pius X, Office and Mass for Feast 201
Thomistic Congress, Date of ... 107

ARTICLES.

Archdeacon John McEncroe (1795-1868), V, VI, VII, VIII (Rev. Roger Wynne), 21, 115, 212, 308
Christian Beginnings (Rev. W. J. Dalton, S.J.) 108
Contrition and Absolution (Rev. A. Regan, C.SS.R.) 288
Suggestions for the Recitation of the Rosary (Rev. B. J. Buxton, S.J.) 12
Theological Context of Law, The (Rev. Patrick M. Farrell, O.P.) 319
Translating Saint Thomas (Rt. Rev. Mgr. C. Roberts, D.D.) 207

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.
(Rev. Clement Tierney, D.D.)

Queenship of Mary, the 326
Sacraments—Signs of Glory, The 123
Sacraments—Signs of Grace, The 28
Symbolic Interpretation of the Mass 222

MORAL THEOLOGY.
(Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D.)

Baptism by Lay Person 38
Breach of Promise, Action for . 40
Censure, Absolution from 337
Communion, Evening, and the Sick 134
Confirmation in danger of death 34
Divorce, Resumption of Married Life after 38
Extreme Unction and Viaticum 131
Limb, Amputation of 42
Mass, Ablutions at, when priest is to binate 36
Reserved Cases, Absolution of . 229
Safe Period, Use of 332
Sunday Observance 233
Trination, Faculty of 128

CANON LAW.
(Very Rev. Mgr. G. C. Gallen, P.C., D.C.L.)

Marriage, Canonical form of ... 341
Marriage Case, Questions about 239
Mixed Marriages, Sincerity of Guarantees in 136

LITURGY.
(Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D.)

Baptismal Font in Hospital Oratory 349
Building a Church 353
Maniple, Removal of, during sermon 144
Mass, Dialogue 47
Oratory, Blessing of candles, ashes and palms in 143
Oratory, Sleeping apartments above 49
Ritual, A new, for American dioceses 145
Rubrics, Decree on simplification, Commentary on 246, 350
Scriptures, Vernacular Versions of, at Mass 44
Vestments, Form of 45

HOMILETICS.
(Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.)

At Bethany 268
Day at Capharnaum, A 51
On Mount Olivet, The Pater .. 358
Towards Jerusalem 149

NOTES.

Archconfraternity of St. Stephen, Deacon and Martyr (Rev. Rex Donohoe) 157
History of Frequent Communion, The (Rev. P. L. Murphy, D.D.) 64
Recent Book on Medical Ethics, A (Rev. J. P. Kenny, S.J.) . 69
Screens, Sacraments, and Hospitals (Rev. H. B. Loughnan, S.J.) 60
Solitary Sins (Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D.) 363
Sub Tuum Praesidium (Rev. Francis Mecham, M.A.) 274

BOOK REVIEWS.

Action This Day at Mass (McMahon) 85
All for All (M. Oliver) 43
Altar Manual 171
Ancient Christian Writers (The Works of St. Patrick (Trans. Bieler)) 173
Archbishop John Carroll (Melville) 93
Archbishop John Carroll and the Liturgy in the Vernacular (Ellis) 93
Catholicism (D'Arcy) 206
Christ of the Sailors (Anson) . 370
Christ in our Time (Plus) 59
Church Building and Furnishing (O'Connell) 353

Church and Infallibility, The (Butler) 177
Damien the Leper (Farrow) ... 278
Difficulties in Life (Gagern) ... 178
Elizabethan Recusant House, An (Edit. Southern) 175
Essays in Satire (Knox) 184
Eternal Galilean, The (Sheen) 176
Failing Wine, The (Oliver) 174
Familiar Prayers (Thurston) .. 172
Formative Years, The (Leary) . 370
God Our Father (Kelly) 331
Guide to Bible 170
Handbook for Catholic Action (Goodman) 325
How to instruct a Convert (Gits) 182
Irish Exiles in Australia (Kiernan) 371
L'Evangile et les Evangiles (Huby) 164
Life of Our Lord for Children (Hunt) 211
Light on the Mountain (Kennedy) 181
Love endureth All Things (Sr. Calista) 86
Man Jesus, The (Bichlmair) .. 280
Manual of Social Ethics (Kavanagh) 92
Matt Talbot and his Times (Purcell) 373
Miracles (Helle) 79
Modern Welfare State (Purcell) 92
More Murder in a Nunnery (Shepherd) 163
New Testament Commentary for English Readers, A (Knox) . 166
Order and Law (Doolan) 92
Our Apostolate 280
Our Faith (Kelly) 221
Padre Pio (Carroll) 87
Philosophy of Religion (Sheen) 81
Priest, The 238
Priest at Prayer, The (Escribano) 180
Problem of Onanism, The (Gagern) 364
Psychiatry for Priests (Dobbelstein) 182
Psychoanalysis and Personality (Nuttin) 82
Reformation in England, The, Vol. II, Vol. III (Hughes), 84, 169
Retreat for the Sick (Edmund) 318
Riddle of Konnersreuth (Siwek) 167
Sacrifice of the Mystical Body, The (Masure) 371
St. Briget of Sweden (Jorgenson) 181
St. Catherine of Siena (Undset) 89
St. John of God (McMahon) .. 11
Schriften zur Theologie, Vol. I, II (Rahner) 276, 307
Short Meditations for Priests (Meley) 114
Simple Talks on the Bible (Johnston) 107
Sing Ye Wisely ("Gregorius") 171
Spiritual Letters of Dom. John Chapman, The (Edit. Huddleston) 164
Spoiled Priest and other stories, A (Sheehan) 43
Theological Distinction of Sins in the Writings of St. Augustine (Durkin) 185
Theology of the Spiritual Life, The (Guibert) 375
Therese of Lisieux (Balthasar) 178
Time and Place of Baptism, The (Conway) 183
Valerio of Bierzo (Aherne) ... 184
Way to Happiness (Sheen) 277
What is Chastity (Boylan) 368
Why I entered the Convent (Ed. Kane) 90
Winning Converts in Australia 50

* * * *

SPECIALISTS IN

WALL & FLOOR TILES

ARCHITECTURAL AND
BUILDERS' HARDWARE

●

ZIEMAN PARKER & GRAHAM PTY. LTD.

201 CLARENCE ST., SYDNEY,
BETWEEN KING AND MARKET STREETS.

●

TELEPHONES — BX 5566, BX 5567, BX 5568